

**The Dissertation Committee for Christopher Ray Davis
certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:**

**TRANSFORMING SOCIAL STUDIES: A CASE FOR THE INCLUSION OF
SYLVIA WYNTER IN THE CANON OF SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION**

Committee:

Anthony L. Brown, Supervisor

Cinthia S. Salinas

Keffrelyn D. Brown

James Patton

Joyce E. King

TRANSFORMING SOCIAL STUDIES: A CASE FOR THE INCLUSION OF
SYLVIA WYNTER IN THE CANON OF SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION

by

Christopher Ray Davis, B.A.; M.Ed.

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School
of the University of Texas at Austin
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Texas at Austin

May 2016

DEDICATION

I know that I did not get here alone. Given this fact, I dedicate this dissertation to the following human beings who only want me to do well by helping others:

My Mother, Mrs. Ruby S. Jones, whose example kept me strong and humble and focused. She only permitted me to keep the long-term task in my vision. She listens.

My Aunt, Mrs. Mae Ann Chauvin, who always models sophisticated intelligence, quiet determination and mesmerizing grace.

My Grandmother, Mrs. Ervie “E” Lee Jones & my Grandfather, Mr. Armond “Dedi” Jones, both of whom tirelessly exuded confidence, dignity, love and respect.

My Grandmother, Mrs. Beatrice Davis, who was brilliant and kind.

Prof. Albert S. Broussard, my academic intellectual father, first Mentor, and expert guide through African American History at Texas A&M University.

Mrs. Mary Broussard, who provided me with good advice at Texas A&M as M2.

Prof. Anthony L. Brown, my second Mentor, who introduced me to Prof. Wynter’s work. He never wavered in his belief of my capabilities with his calming cerebral manner. We built a mutually trusting introspective relationship that endures.

Prof. Joyce E. King, who chose to welcome me into the “Sun” of the academic Family formed by her mentor, Professor Emerita Sylvia Wynter. Thank you for your Trust.

Prof. James R. Patton, who never stopped pushing me to develop my ideas from the time of my Masters through to the completion of my Doctorate. You are my third Mentor.

Prof. Keffrelyn Brown and Prof. Cinthia Salinas, whose words were always honest, stimulating and tough, spurring me to always improve my scholarship.

Ms. Melissa Dunaway, Ms. Sylvia Brown, Mrs. Donnell Guynn, who are trusted friends and colleagues who gave me their minds, hands and hearts in completing this task.

Mrs. Burnell & Madame Kaiser, who were my middle school English teacher and French teacher in Switzerland, who spoke eleven languages between themselves, and never let me forget that I was a beautiful human being with a great mind.

Professor Emerita Sylvia Wynter, who expressed confidence in me through a card she sent me after she was alerted to my existence by Prof. Joyce E. King, her former graduate student. Her embrace of me showed me what it meant to engage in the Praxis of Human.

TRANSFORMING SOCIAL STUDIES: A CASE FOR THE INCLUSION OF SYLVIA WYNTER IN THE CANON OF SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION

By

Christopher Ray Davis, PhD

The University of Texas at Austin, 2016

SUPERVISOR: Anthony L. Brown

The purpose of this dissertation is to make a case that Sylvia Wynter should be included in the social studies education canon. To prove this the Wynterian Approach is used to evaluate the Texas social studies curriculum and instructional materials at the fourth (4th) grade and seventh (7th) grade levels in particular. The case that is specifically studied is the situatedness of Stephen F. Austin as a Texas icon in the social studies and in sites of public memory. The Wynterian Approach offers a way to advance social studies analysis out of simplistic representations and away from easy counternarratives to find what more could be learned by posing the question: What does It mean to be human? In the case of Stephen F. Austin this question opens the door onto a wealth of what would have been easily ignored educational possibilities that Texas students need to face in their academic development and social studies skills development given the task of preparing our students for 21st century problems.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1.	INTRODUCTION and PURPOSE	1
	Theoretical Concerns	10
	The Wynterian Approach	18
	Contents of Chapters to Come	25
Chapter 2.	LITERATURE REVIEW	26
	Theorizing Historical Thinking and Historical Consciousness.....	26
	Developing Historical Thinking and Historical Consciousness in Students and Teachers.....	29
	Developing Historical Thinking and Historical Consciousness through sites of Public Memory	31
	Wynter – Historical Thinking and Historical Consciousness	33
	Reconceptualist Thinkers in Social Studies Education.....	38
	Where does Wynter fit in the Social Studies?.....	44
Chapter 3	METHODOLOGY and METHODS	62
	Wynter and Method of Historical Analysis	62
	Conceptual Meaning of Texts and Sites of Memory	62
	Theory as a Way to Embrace Truth and Transform.....	79
	Methods.....	83
	Description and Guiding Questions	85
	What instructional materials and sites of public memory were examined	90
	Data Collection and Analysis: Textbooks and Public Memory Sites	92
	How does the scholar gather data from each textbook	92

How does the scholar gather data from each public memory site	94
How does the scholar code the data from the fieldnotes.....	97
How does the scholar develop themes that reflect a finding across the data	98
How does the scholar use the Wynterian Approach for Data	99
How does the scholar report the findings.....	103
Method	103
How does Wynter use the Wynterian Approach.....	103
How does the scholar use the Wynterian Approach in Method.....	104
Chapter 4. INTRODUCTION.....	109
Common Narrative of Stephen F. Austin.....	109
Theorizing Common Sense	114
The Official Instructional Materials: Stephen F. Austin for classrooms	134
Common Sense Understanding of Stephen F. Austin.....	136
Stephen F. Austin: The Father of Texas	137
Father of Texas: 4 th grade SBOE-adopted Texas state Instructional Materials	137
Father of Texas: 7 th grade SBOE-adopted Texas state Instructional Materials	144
Stephen F. Austin: Anglo-American Empresario	148
Anglo-American Empresario: 4 th grade SBOE-adopted Texas state Instructional Materials	149
Anglo-American Empresario: 7 th grade SBOE-adopted Texas state Instructional Materials	152

Stephen F. Austin: Liberal Populist Statesman.....	154
Liberal Populist Statesman: 4 th grade SBOE-adopted Texas state Instructional Materials	154
Liberal Populist Statesman: 7 th grade SBOE-adopted Texas state Instructional materials.....	155
Stephen F. Austin in the Sites of Memory	157
The Wynterian Approach Reiterated	165
Summary	169
Chapter 5. How I have used the Wynterian Approach	178
Summary of Wynterian Approach in Use for Chapter 4	179
Rhizomic Linkages to Stephen F. Austin.....	181
Wynterian Approach Applied to Stephen F. Austin as Father of Texas	190
Wynterian Approach Applied to Stephen F. Austin as Anglo-American Empresario	193
Wynterian Approach Applied to Stephen F. Austin as Liberal Populist Statesman	201
Summary of How Wynter Uses Her Approach	207
Chapter 6. A Summation of What Wynter Offers	217
What is the Wynterian Approach?	218
Research Questions Revisited.....	223
The Wynterian Approach in relation to the Literature of Historical Thinking and Historical Consciousness Scholarship	229
Filtering Teaching the Texas Social Studies Curricula and Gap Exposures with the Wynterian Approach.....	234

Future Research Direction in Texas Social Studies	241
Scholars Influenced by Wynter.....	243
The Importance of Wynter to Social Studies Education.....	244
References.....	248-272

CHAPTER 1

“She was a perfect Black woman...naturally a commanding figure...this enterprising woman is not only conducting a pioneer business, but she is rendering a social service.” - Carter G. Woodson

INTRODUCTION and PURPOSE

The quote from Carter G. Woodson's, *The Mis-Education of the Negro*, written in 1933, encapsulates the reverence with which Professor Sylvia Wynter (S. Wynter, personal communication, 03 June 2009) a pioneering woman of African descent from Jamaica, who was the first Black Jamaican woman to publish a novel in 1962, *The Hills of Hebron*. In this novel Wynter laid out the multi-vocal, multi-layered, transformative central question of her research: What does it mean to be human?; which was played out through the individual yet culturally linked life-choices of each of her novel's characters. Wynter was the first Afro-Jamaican woman, a British Black African Caribbean female colonial, to obtain a doctorate in England that she used to raise the cultural awareness of all humans about the universal humanity of African people and people of the African Diaspora by helping to found the Caribbean Arts Movement in 1950's London, England, wherein she wrote and produced radio-dramas and stageplays. Wynter took her academic talents to serve in liberation struggles of Caribbean nations – Trinidad & Tobago and Jamaica (Wynter and D. Scott, 2000). Wynter then developed scholarship rooted in her doctoral specialization of Spanish and Portuguese literature that used the existing Euro-centric, specifically of Spain and Portugal, academic canons, to find narrative

inconsistencies and partial stories that miscast Western European points of view as unchanging universal laws of how the world works and human beings ought to be valued. The human beings in question were the historically intentionally marginalized humans: Blacks, Browns, Reds, Yellows, women, non-propertied Whites, poor Whites, and homosexuals. Some of these groups came to the attention of Europeans in the different yet overlapping contexts of religion, juridical, commercial, and geographic. Each context determined how these differing groups of humans ought to be valued and determined in comparison to Portuguese, Spaniards, English, French, and Dutch (Wynter, 2003, 2001, 1995, 1992). Wynter's work, therefore, attacks what Prof. Joyce E. King termed "epistemological annihilation" in her AERA Presidential Address of May 2015, which is a condition of educational sociopathy wherein some Eurocentric scholars do intentionally situate themselves as sole transmitters of truth in all matters. Other Eurocentric scholars dysconsciously situate themselves as the sole transmitters of truth in all matters about everything in the world. The sociopathy of Eurocentric truth excuses most European psychological and physical atrocities committed against historically marginalized humans and then silences the Blacks by erasing their presence and voices from the written record. Writing is extremely important as this historically has been and remains the preferred and privileged method of scholarly communication and research by Eurocentric academics in the social studies disciplines.

Wynter's work serves as a starting point to move all European-dominant narrative corrupted societies away from the uncritical acceptance of long accreted palimpsest of miseducation - intentionally and dysconsciously enacted cruelties in behavior, speech, media, and human-made institutions, especially educational. Wynter's work, however, goes a step farther in that she does not believe that the historically marginalized humans have a monopoly on the truth nor an essentialist tale to tell. These historically marginalized humans, though actually victimized through miseducation, have the same human-universal responsibility to not only uphold truth and justice but to actively practice truth and justice by actively learning about different cultures and engaging in sustained critical analysis of their own practice and work to prevent and mitigate acts of cruelty. Given the aforementioned, Wynter's work serves as point of departure that explains how to develop alternative cultural narratives that opens a simultaneously overlapping inclusive space, democratic space, caring space, and critical space in which all humans belong (Wynter, 2003, 2001; Wynter and McKittrick, 2015; Wynter and D. Scott 2000). These humans will be, Wynter hopes, epistemologically rejuvenated and will know from the transformative narratives that all people are humans.

The purpose of this dissertation is to make a case for the inclusion of Sylvia Wynter in the social studies education canon in general and the Texas social studies education canon in particular. Wynter's work fills a gap that exists in social studies education because she begins asking her main question: What does it mean to be human?

from the cultural model level. Wynter calls this the “Black Studies Perspective”(Wynter, 1992[1990]). The cultural model approach, part of the Wynterian Approach, insists that the rules of inclusion exclusion in the group be clarified (Legesse, 1973). So Wynter would want to know this: What are the rules for inclusion and/or exclusion in the group known as “human”? Given these questions one could ask: What intentional and dysconscious harms have been visited upon historically marginalized humans that Wynter has developed her Wynterian Approach to attack? Wynter provides solutions. Her “Black Studies Perspective” is derived from Woodson’s pedagogical and curricular scholarship with his “Mis-education Theory,” which contains within it the “Sociogenic Principle” derived from the sociological psychiatric scholarship of Franz Fanon that contains the concepts/methods to evaluate social studies phenomenon of “subjective understanding,” the “alternative cultural model,” the “native cultural model,” and “liminality” (Wynter, 2001).

Wynter’s body of work adds the concept of counter-memory (Brown, 2010) to scholarly work that destabilizes the dominant grand narrative by shifting the usually ignored-and-erased memories of Black humans to the center of a given social studies narrative. This establishes a new way to enhance these fields of historical thinking and historical consciousness at the theoretical level of pedagogy and at the practical level of classroom instruction in the middle school, specifically Texas history (King and Swartz, 2014). “Black” is an inclusive term adopted from the British inclusive term “black” that

means anyone who is not White (Wynter, 1992) and so the term “black” means both people of African descent and dark-skinned people and non-White non-European peoples who were either oppressed through being colonized, conquered or ferociously attacked yet resisted successfully as in the case of the Japanese. This dissertation will be driven by these two questions, which will appear again in chapter 3:

1) How does the Wynterian Approach of Sylvia Wynter, anchored in her Black Studies Perspective which is an alternative cultural model, help to interpret and examine social studies figures and social studies events in K-12 Texas History?

2) How does the Wynterian Approach of Sylvia Wynter provide new conceptual research possibilities to the of study social studies figures and social studies events in K-12 Texas History?

In chapter 2, Wynter’s work will be explained with respect to what she sets as her project and the goal of her project. Under this the question is asked: What does Wynter set as, if any, acceptable outcomes, which can only be gleaned from a full examination of her work? Wynter answers by stating that our world is “an interacting system”, and as such change is constant which means that essentialisms, about how things were and/or must be, are no longer valid because all categories of knowledge must be rewritten.” (Wynter, 1984, pg. 21). Next this extended conversation about her work will be done with respect to demonstrating how it is related to historical thinking and historical consciousness literature, where her work will be situated.

The purpose of this introduction is to offer a discussion of the scholarly work in the social studies education canon that is in theoretical discourse and how this relates and intersects with Wynter's scholarship. The three questions below are meant to be ways of breaking down the research into more manageable chunks that target the actual teaching of Texas Social Studies in a classroom at the fourth (4th) grade and seventh (7th) grade.

- 1) What is the accepted expanse of scholarship that fits into the current canon of social studies?
- 2) Is Wynter simply a revisionist, who only highlights counter-narratives to refute dominant narratives, or does she create a new analytical frontier, a third space or even fourth space in the mode of prominent accepted-as-fellow-traveler-social-studies-scholars -Foucault, Derrida, Bourdieu - in which social studies can be re-energized for the 21st century curricula?
- 3) How might Wynter's work be used by a practitioner, a classroom teacher, to enhance learning opportunities in Texas History at the fourth and seventh grades?

Wynter's process, the Wynterian Approach, will be discussed as to what it proposes to construct: 1) The ultimate goal is to develop through deep excavation of sources that fall within the normal cultural model – dominant discourse – a series of alternative cultural models that are what Geertz (1973) calls, “thick descriptions” to counter the historically intentional and historically dysconscious narratives of miseducation. 2) Use the conceptual lens of Wynter's Black Studies Perspective, an

alternative cultural model, and its excavation tools of a) sociogenic principle and b) subjective understanding which both exist in the space of liminality; which is especially important to understand because this buttresses the assertion of Wynter (2006, 2003, 2000, 1997, 1992[1990], 1970, 1969, 1968) that there are no essentialisms with humans given that humans are products of the overlapping environments into which they were born and as these environments change so to do humans adapt. The final tool is to apply the (c) “rejection of cruelty” test; this concept is what grounds the Wynterian Approach in the practice of the human, because it demands that for every human decision an accountability toward being aware of how one’s actions or a group’s actions either support or harm the preservation of human dignity in the outcomes that emerge from those chosen actions. This drives to intent and so “dysconsciousness” is directly challenged which, in turn, always re-centers the question: What does it mean to be human? Note that by supporting the “rejection of cruelty” Wynter (2003, 1997, 1992[1990], 1970) demands that the social studies actor engage deeply in evaluating the elements that allow certain actions and ideas to exist in a society – sociogeny and subjective understanding become objects of necessary scrutiny instead of accidental happenstance. This is evaluative power.

This discussion of these issues will highlight aspects of these foundational works and a case will be made as to why Professor Wynter's work deserves to be included. At its core, Wynter’s work is about explaining with precision the intersection of overlapping

ideas that contributed over time (historically speaking since the 1400's to the intentional physical and psychological brutalization and oppression of people of African diasporic descent so that a transcultural understanding can be built. One goal is to prevent these horrors from having to become a lived experience as she and others had to endure.

Wynter has these self-articulated positionalities: African Diaspora human, Black woman, Jamaican woman, British colonial subject, author, Portuguese and Spanish scholar, African American, Caribbean, university-educated, mother, daughter, wife, tenured professor (Wynter and Scott, 2000). She does not view any of these as essential to understanding her but rather as useful guideposts in building a narrative one might grasp. Her fear was that although she had become able to transform herself using the masters' tools and her native tools by expressing in writing her own sense of self and her concerns, she had witnessed and studied how others who were similarly situated throughout the world had been miseducated intentionally to think less of themselves and to embrace a self-abnegating dependence on others who do not view you as another co-equal human being. To further this project of emancipatory human-ness, Wynter has articulated a series of interlocking theoretical and concrete frameworks that embrace information from all continents in all forms (Wynter, 2006, 2000, 1992, 1992[1990], 1990, 1969).

Wynter's work stands out because she moves beyond race, gender, class, sexuality, disability to theorize about the human. That is what makes humans human and

their actions human actually is not easily divided into tidy categories, but rather is interdisciplinary, intersubjective and multi-vocal. Wynter recognizes the complexity of humans and so when she theorizes she is careful to engage in what Carl Grant (2009) calls “pedagogy”. That is Wynter creates an explanation of human actions that “move beyond exclusion” and “articulates social justice principles,” because her research into the foundations of human actions as shown in particular cultures shows that “categories of social identity including culture, ethnicity, race, gender, sexual orientation, class, and disability are social markers” that administer how people are materially, geographically, and socially situated (Grant, 2009, p. 245-246). Wynter problematizes established concepts in the social studies education canon, such as Seixas’ (2004) “historical consciousness.” By questioning this widely accepted social studies canonical concept, Wynter creates a space wherein a counter-concept such “historical dysconsciousness” could be introduced. The counter-concept is derived from social studies scholars Woodson’s (1933) concept of “miseducation” Joyce E. King’s (1991) established concept of “dysconscious racism” joined with Carl Grant’s (2009) “anti-pedagogy.” Wynter’s (2006, 2003, 2000, 1995, 1992) point is that no single idea nor concept is sacred, fixed and above the need for consistent sustained critique, because this is why this very conversation is happening – artificial, human-made, limits were placed on certain groups of people and their beliefs leading to disruptive benefits and harms and then certain groups which could cut across already artificial human-made boundaries were given dominance, which was unearned, unjustified, unethical and indefensible.

Theoretical Concerns

Harold O. Rugg (1952), the founder of the discipline of social studies, stated that “the center of the discipline must be the actual root problems of the civilization. The curriculum must employ the history of actual trends and forces that brought about these problems. Teachers must critically confront and teach all proposed solutions for the issues of our times. [This] practice is the essence of democracy (13).” Rugg further argues that teachers of social studies ought to be encouraged to instruct their students along a “creative path” that contains the in depth study of society and culture, the study of behavior, the of the art of expression. These broad categories include the disciplines suggested below by the NCSS and by Banks as the disciplines that make up the social studies. For Rugg the social studies was a “culture-molding process” because the major institutions that make American society great – family, government, church, schools, press – will be the ways through which the American people come to understand the conditions and problems of their democracy so that they can be actively engaged in its development.

According to the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS), the largest professional association for social studies educators in the world, social studies is defined as: “...the integrated study of the social sciences and humanities to promote civic competence...drawing upon [the] disciplines of anthropology, archaeology, economics, geography, history, philosophy, political science, psychology, religion and sociology...to

help young people [learn] to make informed and reasoned decisions for the public good as citizens of as culturally diverse, democratic society in an interdependent world (NCSS, 9).” What one ought to note from this definition is that it binds teachers, themselves, with a civic obligation of this discipline to teach with the purpose of helping to develop good citizens who seek to add value to society. In addition, the definition enjoins teachers with an intellectual duty of developing and deepening their knowledge of the related disciplines that can be studied separately even as they mesh together; this a rather complex discipline that too often gets reduced to simply history and rote memorization of lots of stuff about the past that has no relevance to students’ lives.

James A. Banks (2006/[1973]) concurs that social studies is a complex subject to teach when he states that when planning to teach a topic in social studies teachers should remember that topics often can have a comparative focus. This means that key concepts ought to be identified that could have different meanings in for different disciplines. To illustrate his point he offers a chart for organizing concepts around the disciplines that comprise social studies – mirrors the NCSS definition - that points out that teacher should know that the term “separatism” has both a political science meaning and sociological usage but that political science has used term more based upon his research. Banks then goes further by adding that social studies could be taught as “ethnic studies” to increase ethnic literacy. As such, the approach to this that would be best is comparative ethnic studies wherein students, for example at the middle grades, are introduced to “organizing

generalizations” that could be made low-level at first and increased to intermediate-level as the students are introduced to research methods to allow them to delve into the topics in greater depth and begin to see the ways in which ethnic groups have been similarly harmed and benefitted at different times in history in different places.

Banks (2006/[1999]; 2006/[1973]) also states that another useful purpose of social studies is that it can be used to teach inquiry and decision-making from multiple perspectives. He suggests that “the basic purpose of social science inquiry is to derive knowledge in the form of facts, generalizations, and theories.” He then points that the purpose of decision-making is to select, synthesize and apply the derived knowledge. One useful example he uses is that of examining the American Revolution from multiple ethnic group perspectives in order to uncover what each group could gain or lose from a successful American uprising and/or a British victory over the recalcitrant colonists. Another example he uses is one in which the question is one of value clarification with the purpose to engage the skills needed to develop reflective decision-making. In this example he illustrates that the foundational question can be filtered through each of the seven disciplines that comprise social studies with each discipline yielding a different answer with differing emphasis on what comes to the fore as the most salient factors in the decision. Finally Banks points out that the social studies teacher must emphasize that decisions reached do influence real human behaviors.

Rugg, Banks, and the NCSS all offer complimentary definitions of what the social studies is and that this discipline is a complex discipline that can ultimately play a pivotal roll in creating a liberty-filled culturally diverse society. Teachers of social studies have a duty to be prepared to competently instruct in the interdisciplinary milieu by demonstrating to their students how to notice the key concepts of the differing disciplines. Finally, teachers must facilitate opportunities for their students to engage in doing research to develop new knowledge that is directly related to a current problem in society that has a historical basis. The knowledge the students discover should be applied in helping the students develop discourses about decisions made to solve a problem from multiple perspectives.

Scholars concerned with the way the U.S. historical narrative is portrayed in schools and society tend to use their scholarship to expose a duality, a contradiction, in that emerges from a study of a particular social studies topic using the dominant discourse. In United States' social studies, the scholars tend to evaluate a master narrative and show how past instantiations of the narrative came up short in showing alternative perspectives. Du Bois (1995) noted in *Black Reconstruction* that too often history in textbooks is sanitized such that men with flaws and numerous faults are made to seem angelic and superhuman; this is propaganda (p. 722). The works of four scholars, such as Derrick P. Aldridge, Derrick A. Bell, Dennis Carlson, and Diana E. Hess, will be examined to illustrate this tendency toward showing duality by maintaining the master narrative but

showing other information that disagrees and interrupts the truthfulness of the master narrative.

Sylvia Wynter, has been left out of the social studies canon despite the fact that her work embraces all of the disciplines of the social studies. Her work, however, is not simply interdisciplinary, because this term implies that her work embraces and supports the continued project begun in the already existing meta-narratives of dividing humans from humans by asserting that one group of humans is superior in these categories: reason, beauty, skin color, physiognomy, language, technology, culture production, economic planning, invention, masculinity, Christianity, Westernization – *humanitas* – while the other group is tagged as inferior to *humanitas* in all the aforementioned categories – *anthropos*. Note that *anthropos*, although human is defined as an inferior human plus that human-ness is suspect and as such is constructed by *humanitas* as having nothing of value to offer (Mignolo, 2009; Osamu, 2006; Wynter and Scott, 2000).

Wynter's work embraces interdisciplinarity and moves it into a new space, because interdisciplinarity is just an extension of the failed Enlightenment project, which stated that all men are created equal and then intentionally excluded most women, and inhabitants of Africa, Asia, North America, South America and their descendants. Wynter's work is "polyversal." This is a term that challenges the term "uni-versal," which means "one word"/ "one voice" implying a unity of use of language and terms and the ideas that emerged from that unity and the "duality" implying stating that there are

but two narratives, one dominant and one counter. “Polyversal” is a term derived from the works of these social studies scholars who wrote before and co-temporaneously with Wynter. These scholars and their ideas were known to Wynter - Woodson (1933) “mis-education Theory,” W.E.B. Du Bois (1903; 1935) “double consciousness,” and “propaganda,” Fanon (1952) “Sociogeny,” Rugg (1952) “social studies – creative path,” and Victor Turner (1969) “multivocality”. All of these scholars’ works directly influenced or paralleled her analyses of what must be done to elevate all people to the level of human.

Wynter (2006, 2003, 2000, 1995, 1992) posits that in her work she uses the language of the dominant culture to establish their particular worldview – subjective understanding. By analyzing a given scholarly work or cultural product in the dominant language Wynter can determine what that particular cultural group and/or nation viewed as most important in their conceptions of themselves on their life-journey. Wynter, however, finds that the examination of cultural products of the dominant group also exposes their areas of weakness and shows them to be merely humans with a particular culture. Wynter then examines whom did the dominant language group encounter and what were the outcomes of that encounter/those encounters. Wynter finds that a liminal space is opened, because the language group that suffered the encounter has found themselves subjugated in such a way that they have lost their autonomy/freedom and their culture and their language/modes of expression. As such they are made liminal – a

place to where those who are subjugated must go because they recognize their predicament as victim, while the memory persists of their lives before subjugation – a space of adaptation for defense of human dignity. The subjugated culture group still articulates their narratives but now in the newly established dominant language. Wynter analyzes these cultural products to determine whether the now-designated *anthropos* actually do persist in re-articulating their culture. The essence of the polyversality for Wynter is that these articulations all exist at the same time without allowing one to cancel out the other. In Wynter's polyverse polyvocality is the rule. Polyvocality is the fact of many voices articulating from their particular positions in culture, time, space, class, gender, race, positionality, language at any given moment. The polyversality encompasses Wynter's Black Studies Perspective because the term "black" for Wynter is a term of polyvocal unity in that all of those groups constructed as and forcibly placed in the position of *anthropos* are all designated as non-White, non-existent, and peripheralized without history, culture and reason. Mudimbe (1988) makes a very useful point here when he asserts that there is an element of stupidity when attempting to articulate a counternarrative from an *anthropos* using the language of *humanitas* because something is lost in translation; here is the imperfection of Wynter's polyversality. The work is too important not to continue because there are *anthropos* and *humanitas* – all humans -who can be inspired by these previously unknown cultural expressions. This is Wynter's Approach that adds heft and value to social studies.

Wynter (2003) wrote, “The struggle of our new millennium will be one between the ongoing imperative of securing the well-being of our present ethno-class conception of the human, Man, which over-represents itself as if it were the human itself, and that of securing the well-bring, and therefore the full cognitive and behavioral autonomy of the human species itself/ourselves (p.266).” Here is the problem that she articulates in some form in her works. This is a voice of transformation that seeks not to do battle with the established dominant culture simply by positing counternarratives but rather accepts the persistence of the dominant narrative and elects to articulate all of the other narratives that continue to be articulated.

In her essay, “1492: A New World View,” Wynter (1995) traces the development of the colonial machine that came to mean great benefit for a few and great harm up to extinction for most. This essay is seminal because in it Wynter establishes her expertise at using the dominant cultural language to establish their particular local mindset as well as the horrific problems that arise when that local culture is imposed on others peoples with other worldviews and life imperatives. What makes this essay work as a social studies tool for research is that throughout the essay Wynter posits questions about the “benefits” and the “lowpoints” from the perspectives of Columbus, Spain, the Catholic Church, the Taino, which opens the space to deeply analyze previously accepted truths the topic of the discovery of the New World. Wynter does not assert that there are any “correct” answers; however, she does allow that one could be troubled by what are

dissonances that crop up between the triumphal conquest of spreading the love of God accompanied by wholesale exploitation, expropriation and rape by the same highly civilized people – the Spanish.

The Wynterian Approach

The Wynterian Approach is the flexible concrete that will fill the gap in the social studies curriculum and always has at its core the question: What does it mean to be human [in this particular given circumstance]? To answer this question requires doing the necessary research that reads across disciplines to establish relationships between supposedly disparate and separate academic disciplines and establish logical connections to prevent what could be described as aporia or moving in motionless gyrations. The Wynterian Approach recognizes that all academic disciplines are nothing more than human-made contingent constructions. Given this, all subjects are related. It is just a matter of taking the time to investigate where, when, how, and under what circumstances the relationship manifests itself. The goal is to “define in” people to being human as opposed to “selecting out” people from being human. This is what Wynter calls “the praxis of being human.” The elements of the Wynterian Approach are:

1) Alternative cultural model [ACM]– This is the narrative that the person develops to distinguish her/his subjective existence of how she/she understands how she/he fits into the her/his specific contingent space in the world and history. For Blacks/non-Whites – people defined out by European/White dominance narratives as

lacking in humanness – the ACM is a counter-narrative that contains counter-memories that stand in defiance as equally real and valid to the dominance narrative known as the native cultural model or standard. The ACM represents what Geertz called a “thick description” of a particular “local culture” and stands as a gateway through which acceptance and tolerance can be attained by those who want to choose the praxis of being human. The ACM stands as an antidote to what Woodson called “miseducation” and what Du Bois called “propaganda” and “double consciousness.” An example of an ACM that Wynter (2006, 2000, 1992[1990]) created to trouble the dominance discourse was the Black Studies Perspective (BSP). What BSP does is shifts the subject to Intentionally Historically Marginalized Groups’ (IHMGs) perspectives as the origin-point/standpoint from which to begin any social studies inquiry. The ACM exists on its own and in opposition to the native cultural model (NCM) – articulations of the dominant discourse/hegemonic culture – that are local cultures developed under particular contingent circumstances that have been misapplied to another set of largely unrelated contingent circumstances in a different place. The NCM’s goal is to replace, weaken, demean, marginalize, peripheralize and eventually erase the existing local culture with itself as the new culture. A concrete example is the local culture of Spain was used to replace the existing local culture of the Aztecs after Cortes and his conquistadors defeated the Aztecs in war. With Spanish culture and its manifestations in the Casta system and the encomienda system as well as rancheros and the enslavement of the Indios and Negros became the embedded culture as it fit the needs of the victors and

intentionally harmed those people who had become dislodged from power (Wynter, 1995).

Wynter argued that when doing the research to fully excavate the way these native cultural models came to dominate that one ought to be wary of accepting explanations in wholecloth from Foucault and Marx. Wynter asserts that these European theorists, who might well be in favor of social justice and do make useful arguments, still do not fully understand the frames of reference of humans, like the Indios and Negros/Africans who have been made symbolically and, therefore, socially inferior. For Wynter, a substantially more accurate articulation of an alternate cultural model can emerge best from humans who have been marginalized and made liminal through intention in history (King, 2006, pgs. 361-366).

2) Sociogenic Principle – This concept is derived from Fanon (1952). The concept means that the term “human” is defined in any particular society in a duality. The dominance narrative created and deployed by the group in power – in the case of the world this means Western European powers that did the following: 1) directly engaged in the Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade and/or the Trans-Saharan Slave Trade; 2) established colonies in lands they encountered by using dominance narratives/NCMs [religious, juridical, social and racial/scientific] reasoning whether false or not to justify the taking/stealing of territory from indigenous inhabitants; 3) intentionally attempted to erase the cultural memories of conquered indigenous inhabitants and enslaved Africans

and indigenous inhabitants as a program to allow Whites/people of European descent considered “pure” as defined by themselves to believe that each one of them no matter how low of social status was always better than any enslaved or non-enslaved Black person [Indigenous person and/or person of African descent]; the Blacks were taught lessons of their innate inferiority as compared to Whites. This could be accomplished through deprivation of materials and use of everyday cruelty at whim/will by Whites upon Blacks. The purpose of the sociogenic principle is that it shows how psychology – control of the mental state and mental images – is vitally important for Whites (Wynter 2000).

At the same time the Blacks continued to express themselves as humans through counter-narratives that took/deployed in these forms - oratory, dance, religious ceremony, caring-compassionate behavior toward one another, entertainment and writing. These counter-narratives were often products of hybridity and so were original human creations. These ACMs expressed what these people about themselves and their true place in the world as humans.

3) Subjective Understanding – In the Wynterian Approach this concept applies explicitly to Intentionally Historically Marginalized Groups (IHMGs) because these humans as individuals and as collectives were “selected out” by people of the dominance narrative as less than human objects; however, the IHMGs “defined in” themselves as humans by appropriating the Word to build counter-narratives. The IHMGs used the

Word (symbols, signs, artifacts, methods of research, languages) to posit the rejection of cruelty as one of the definitive practices of being human. Given this, the IHMGs were able to show that a transformation in the use of the Word from an exclusionary tool (selecting out) to an inclusionary to (defining in) was a vital part of the transformational foundation of the practice of being human. When expressed in a counter-narrative/ACM this means that the person expressing this story contests the ways in which she/he is defined by people who use the dominance narrative/NCM. Subjective understanding is a process through which one comes to see oneself as a human engaging in self-respect who respects others as human no matter that there will be agreements and disagreements.

4) Liminality – This concept means that difference exists within the interpretation of any set of circumstances. Liminality is the space created by the articulation of the ACM by those peoples defined as lacking humanness by those who have been mis-educated to believe that they are the chosen and innately superior according to their “local cultural” definitions that they have transformed into the dominance narrative/NCM. To be liminal is to exist in a dynamic status always unfixed and non-essential and poised to use any aspect of another culture/way of living that is helpful to the definition of oneself as human.

5) Rejection of Cruelty – This is the most important concept because it is about not doing harm. Cruelty is defined in this way: The intentional and dysconscious infringement of equalitarian human rights of another human being to have the

opportunity to participate in society as democratic citizen. This definition comes from the abolitionist idea that true Christians have a moral duty to protect their rights as individuals to freedom and that their fellow Christians to these same freedoms. This is the golden rule articulated as a practice of being human. Nowhere does this definition of cruelty state that if in disagreement then there can be no mutual respect. To reject cruelty is to reject intentional and dysconscious abuse that is expressed in cultures over time. Slavery and segregation and anti-woman and anti-black and anti-disability and anti-homosexual actions such as legislation are definitely cruelty as these are expressly meant to limit the life-affirming opportunities that these designated persons would have to build a life in support of human dignity. Given this in the Wynterian Approach every expression of an alternative cultural model (ACM) or native cultural model (NCM) must be examined for cruelty because cruelty inhibits the practice of being human. This new perspective that the Wynterian Approach encourages ties back into the “subjective understanding” as could be shaped by the “sociogenic principle.” This means that a single person or group of people could come to view themselves in a particular dominant way while simultaneously viewing themselves through a disparaged lens as a subjugated being because of the simultaneously occurring contested and contingent discourses that exist in any society at any given time. Also, this could be called simply an appeal to human rights but one must know how human rights have developed over time. With Wynter there is no rest for the motivated truthseeker.

These are the conceptual lenses of the Wynterian Approach that allow Wynter to always maintain focus on the central question of her research: What does it mean to be human? Each of these lens allows for a resituating of any given social studies issue and the elements contained within that issue. For example, an issue that will be examined is Stephen F. Austin normatively represented as a Texas icon in the official Texas state social studies curricula for fourth (4th) grade and seventh (7th) grade. This fact of representation in the curricula leads to an examination of the instructional materials for these grade levels and how these represent Stephen F. Austin given that the corporations that create instructional materials follow the lead of state curricula to create content. After filtering all of these research topics through the various tools of the Wynterian Approach then I must be ready for what emerges. The directions in which the emergent findings send my research will enlarge my ability to explain the many different perspectives or alternative cultural models (Wynter 1992[1990]) that I find oriented toward defeating “epistemological annihilation” (King & Swartz, 2016) or “mis-education” (Woodson, 1933) or “aberration of the self” (Fanon, 1952) all of which are intentional harms committed to justify the harmful actions and dehumanizing semiotic encouraged by the persistent mythology masquerading as an essential truth of the dominance discourse or native cultural model. Wynter recognizes that there are multiple persistent contested narratives with varying degrees of hegemony that contemporaneously exist in any space – physical (geography) or mental (psychology) – in which multiple voices (multi-vocality) (Turner, 1952) – dominant and alternative - can be heard. Given this there can be no

essentialisms when it comes to opening spaces for all people to explain: What does it mean to be human? – so that they can all sit down and talk about a little culture together.

Contents of Chapters to Come

In the next chapters, readers will find in chapter 2 a literature review of the social studies education canon that pertains to the Wynterian Approach. Arguments are made that propose to show the logical synergy between established social studies canon scholars and Wynter's scholarship. In addition, in chapter 3, readers will find the methodology and method explained as to how this dissertation proposal was constructed. In chapter 4 readers will find an explanation of the research and the findings with respect to the official Texas state social studies curriculum for the fourth (4th) grade and seven (7th) grade and the teaching of Texas social studies, popularly known as Texas history and geography. Also an examination of the representation of Stephen F. Austin as a Texas icon will be problematized. In chapter 5, an analysis of the findings in my research of the literature of historical thinking and historical consciousness, as well as, the reconceptualist scholars in social studies education curriculum using the Wynterian Approach as the lens is available. Finally in chapter 6, I offer a summary of what I did and what I found throughout my research and offer ways in which the Wynterian Approach can advance social studies education.

CHAPTER 2

“Slights and indignities are a part of the Negro daily life...and white...indifference is inexcusable.”

- Kerner Commission Report: The New Media and Disorders, 1968

“How many times does a tree have to fall before you admit you heard it?”

- Robert Wolcott, EPA Commissioner under President Ronald

LITERATURE REVIEW

Theorizing Historical Thinking and Historical Consciousness

This chapter has chosen to examine from the literature of social studies education some of the key theoretical arguments that are most relevant in advancing the work of Sylvia Wynter. In this chapter one will examine the works of scholars who theorize historical thinking and historical consciousness. The purpose of historical thinking and historical consciousness scholarship is to offer ways in which people can normatively be trained to engage in higher order thinking as a normal part of the day. Also, the work of reconceptualist scholars, who develop counternarrative arguments in social studies education that challenge the standard limited knowledge in the field. The reconceptualists examine mainstream social studies arguments that are built using the research tools and point of view of the dominant discourse to explain important social studies actors – Rosa Parks - and social studies events – *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954) decision – that actually distorts the historical person or historical event for easy digestion into the social studies canon. What the reconceptualists problematize are simple binaries that generally

are used to explain what counternarrativity means. In fact, these scholars move beyond simple binaries into the realm of multi-perspectival outcomes that can and do co-exist with established scholars. An example of this would be Bell's assertion that the Brown decision happened to coincide with a new direction in which governmental elites – US Supreme Court justices - felt compelled to steer the United States. These scholars are all considered to be entrenched members of the social studies canon while Wynter is not. The theoretical work of these scholars and Wynter's work complement one another.

The Wynterian Approach (Wynter 2005, 2000, 1992[1990]) includes the research tools: 1) the sociogenic principle which means that each society determines what will be its dominant discourses of power that hold a highly important roles in shaping the ways in which public institutions are organized and the messages they issue; 2) developing alternative cultural models that emancipate learning to challenges inhabited by those groups who are normally marginalized, such as Blacks in the United States; 4) subjective understanding which explain the particular viewpoint of any human who expresses a point of view; 5) Reject cruelty in all forms as this is a way to embed the central question of Wynter: What does it mean to be human? in all one's research endeavors. This observation will raise questions that will be posed in this chapter that will be resolved later in the chapter. What is the point of historical thinking and historical consciousness? What do the reconceptualists do that troubles the existing social studies scholarship on chosen important social studies events and social studies actors? The restatement of the

elements of the Wynterian Approach serves as a reminder that it is these theoretical tools of analysis that will be coupled with the literature of historical thinking and historical consciousness and the social studies education reconceptualists to determine what new avenues for research emerge as the an advancement in social studies education.

Is social studies education only about creating a habit of mind that craves a deep, detail-oriented examination of any social studies issue? Ought students to be ushered into the unboundedness of liminal space with respect to building historical arguments? Is there a beyond for which to strive such as instead of a limited historical thinking and historical consciousness one is taught a social studies thinking and social studies consciousness which embraces the praxis of human-ness? In posing these opening paragraph questions the intent is not to refute the established scholarship in historical thinking and historical consciousness nor to denigrate the reconceptualists, but rather to push it into the gaps and complementary spaces that Wynter's scholarship through application of the Wynterian Approach as an advanced lens of analysis that provides a way to orient social studies education to embrace the praxis of human (McKittrick, 2015; Wynter, 2000, 1992[1990]). Given this, this literature review will demonstrate how current social studies scholars considered to be entrenched in the social studies education canon fits into the canon. Embedded in this discussion will be a suggestion of the gaps that open in these embedded scholars scholarship that opens a space for Wynter's

scholarship with her Wynterian Approach when it is used as an additional theoretical lens through which to examine social studies topics.

Developing Historical Thinking and Historical Consciousness in Students and Teachers

Seixas, Wineburg, VanSledright, Nora and Levesque are five key theoretical scholars of historical thinking and historical consciousness whose works have been read for this study. Each of these scholars has a body of work that demonstrates a particular conscious intent that compliments Wynter and a particular dysconscious intent that suggests/opens a gap that Wynter addresses and fills. These five scholars share a conscious focus on how historical thinking and historical consciousness is developed in the social studies canon rooted in European hegemony. That is white supremacy as it manifests itself in what is shown, discussed, and used as examples of study. The white supremacy as dysconsciousness manifests in what these scholars have by habit of their own educational development not included nor discussed because of silenced voices they themselves received by not being exposed to the experiences of non-European, non-White peoples as humans. Remember that humans actually have an authentic articulated voice that emerges from their own actually lived experiences whether in their own language or the imposed language of their conqueror/colonizer/exploiter, which is usually erased from European hegemonic social studies education scholarship. What does this

mean for students and teachers who must learn historical thinking and historical consciousness and how to implement them?

There are several definitions of historical thinking and historical consciousness that converge. Per Levesque (2008) historical thinking can be defined as knowing how historical knowledge has been constructed and what that construction means. At root for all of them, according to Seixas (1993a; 1993b), historical thinking covers these characteristics: 1) historical significance; 2) analyzing, evaluating, and refining knowledge about historical events; 3) engaging the agency, empathy, and moral judgment about choices and outcomes of historical events. Understanding what the components historical thinking are will prevent what Nora (1996) suggests is history merely being something remembered for a given situation and then forgotten. In developing historical thinking both Seixas (2006, 2002) and Levesque (2008) understandably focus on the development of historical thinking in Canada with their inquiry being into the development of historical thinking and historical consciousness among the two main European colonizers of Canada, the Anglo-Canadians and the Franco-Canadians. Wineburg and VanSledright focus on how historical thinking and historical consciousness are taught to students. Wineburg (2001; 1994) states that “history holds the potential, only partly realized, of humanizing us in ways offered by few other areas in the school curriculum.” Wineburg (2004), VanSledright (2002) and Seixas (1999) all found that students at all levels of schooling are dependent on teacher-guidance for how to do

historical thinking and developing historical consciousness. Such a problem returns to the high importance of teacher training and teacher intellectual development in the social studies so that as Rugg (1952), the founder of the discipline of social studies, commented that too often social studies teachers are simply reflections of limitations and biases of the communities in which they teach, which means that the students are not challenged to develop the ability to think critically or as Geertz would say engage in “thick description.” The skills of historical thinking and historical consciousness are important for teachers especially as they will be the first to introduce students to these concepts. A teacher without deep understanding cannot possibly prepare students adequately to perform what Seixas (2002; 1993) emphasizes is critical and disciplinary studies of the past, both inside and outside the classroom.

Developing Historical Thinking and Historical Consciousness through Sites of Public Memory

In discussing historical thinking and historical consciousness development with respect to sites of public memory one runs into a problem that David Lowenthal is a tension between heritage and history augmenting public memory. Seixas (2006) suggest that public memory, citizenship, and history education are useful in developing historical consciousness. Lowenthal (2013) suggests that heritage dumbs-down the actual learning of the discipline of history in that heritage mainly seeks to activate personal memories, which may or may not be real because a visceral experience can feel like it really took

place in the past. In addition, Lowenthal asserts that modern culture with its emphasis on instant gratification serves as a hindrance to museums building installations that tell as full a story as possible because so many people have become accustomed to a right to not be offended and only have interactive fun. The problem that emerges is an implicit question of which human or group of humans lack the importance to have their stories researched and remembered because all humans belong to a public that is a part of the human collective on this planet.

VanSledright (2008), Wineburg (2001), Levesque (1996), Nora (2009) and Seixas (2006) suggest that historical thinking and historical consciousness are dependent upon perspective-taking, which would lead to a consideration of the how and the why a particular historic event or person receive the imprimatur of being historically significant. Nora (2001; 1996) and Lowenthal (2013) suggests that history trumped public memory because numerous stories that exist in a living societies have become much more detailed such that previously easily dismissed and marginalized stories cannot be ignored as irrelevant. Because of better documentation and use of accepted research methods public memory can necessarily be expanded to include more subjects from American culture. This inclusion can be shown in the scholarship that addresses public memory of Woyshner (2009), Brown & Brown (2010), Cope (1994), and Leon-Portilla (2006), who suggest that the expansion of public memory ought to include people of the African Diaspora and Native Americans. What these scholars show when taken together are the

limits of heritage as being useful to social studies education and the need for public memory to always consider that if an event is human-based the inquiry into it is never trivial. The idea that a human or group of humans lack significance is a consideration that shows a gap in public memory.

Wynter—Historical Thinking and Historical Consciousness

Wynter's scholarship suggests a way to fill the gaps that emerges in the current social studies education canon of human thinking, human consciousness and public memory after a deliberate reading and re-reading of the relevant social-studies-education-canon-endorsed scholarship. Wynter's central question is: "What does it mean to be human?" This question sits as the foundation of the Wynterian Approach and Wynter's scholarship. The embedded social studies scholars mentioned do not use this question as their foundational question. The embedded scholars appear to be well-intentioned and have done excellent work pointing in the direction of Wynter yet they are simply performing their scholarly tasks from the culture entrenched and ossified in European hegemony. Given this positionality of Eurocentric human, self-defined as White and the singular perfect human model, what more could these scholars be expected to do? Wynter would suggest that their scholarship is inhibited by their inability to think from a liminal perspective as all of them are White males of European descent – the only true humans always already worthy of respect according to historical examples (King, 2008; Wynter, 2015,2000, 1995, 1992[1990]). Wynter's (2000; Wynter and Smith, 2000; McKittrick,

2015) own life suggests that as a member of several contemporaneous co-existing contingent personal positionalities – 1) of African descent, 2) Black woman, 3) African Diaspora female, 4) British colonial subject, 5) Black British colonial subject, 6) educated Black woman trained in European hegemonic methods of scholarship, 7) speaker of several European languages, 8) home-trained in African traditions of community, 9) mutual respect of fellow human beings and survival, and, foremost, 10) a human - that she like any other formally educated human has a duty and responsibility to look beyond any narrowly engaged worldview – be it African, European, Rastafarian, Jamaican, American – or assigned to her by external forces or constructed by herself out of her research causing her to see herself simultaneously multi-perspectively. The challenge that Wynter takes up is how to facilitate the vocality of humans who had intentionally been written out of the historical records of all European nations, because these humans were seen as lacking in creativity, civilization, history, beauty, and intellectual capacity. Wynter’s scholarship embodies a notion that Lowenthal (2013) set forth when he suggested that societies have been educated in seeing dualisms and that these dualisms are inadequate because science and human societies are complex and deal in probabilities not certainties.

What does Wynter do? Wynter offers a new lens call with the Wynterian Approach (WA from here on out in this section.). Her lens is rooted in the concepts of legendary scholars of the Black Diaspora, Carter G. Woodson’s (1933) “Miseducation

Theory,” W.E.B. Du Bois’ (1935; 1903) concepts of “propaganda” and “double consciousness,” and Franz Fanon’s (1952; 1961) concepts “sociogeny” and “the damned of the Earth.” From these scholars she openly solicits the work of other scholars whose work asks about the conditions in which humans live. Given that Woodson’s “miseducation” is her foundation, she refuses to engage in this harmful practice by summarily dismissing work that is considered outside of her discipline, because she recognized that humans do not live their lives according to neatly demarcated academic disciplines. Wynter sees that human progress and human education is a series of fits and starts that have emerged from a given configuration of circumstances – a contingent situation – which have to be investigated to determine whether any relationship exists among them or not. She takes a catholic viewpoint in that she uses scholars across disciplines, because she practices being human. This means that she does not view the ideas of any human, scholar or not, as lacking in substance but rather the idea could be destructive to the development of humanity. For Wynter there are no essential, all-purpose answers that fit every circumstance in which humans are involved.

The gap that Wynter addresses in the historical thinking and historical consciousness scholarship involves the choice of human subjects. Seixas, Levesque, Wineburg, VanSledright, and Nora do not expand their scholarly inquiries beyond a narrow Eurocentric point of view. Although these scholars would not be considered to be racist they are still dysconsciously racist at best with respect to their attachment to

learned White supremacy, which simply ignores non-Whites without even a nod. An examination of media and social studies textbooks as when filtered through Miseducation Theory will show that since the beginning of European colonization of the Americas, Africa, and Asia that non-Europeans have been written out of the historical narratives and/or had their human image so distorted as to resemble a monstrosity. Given this similar distortions in valuing non-White human beings must occur in historical thinking and historical consciousness as taught to university students in teacher-training programs dominated by this narrow-gauge Eurocentric pedagogy, which extends to students taught the same distortions by their teachers in the classroom at the elementary, secondary, and university level. This is a disturbing line of attachment and association that goes untroubled.

The closing the gap in human understanding of how the skills and habits of historical thinking, historical consciousness, and historical understanding are developed among members of the African Diaspora (Bogues, 2006; Eudell, 2006; King, 2006) which shows that humans, no matter what their race, ethnicity, or language, or sex and gender share skills. Wynter does assert that the skills and habits of creating a valued society do reside in all humans and the cultures they inhabit. She goes about demonstrating the co-existing skills and habits actually do exist by embracing interdisciplinary arguments that cover the social studies disciplines of history, geography, sociology, psychology, economics, political science and anthropology. An example of Wynter doing this occurs

when she argues how Columbus and his Spanish crew developed their worldview and how the Taino with their own worldview when they encountered one another in the Taino homeland that the Spanish christened Hispaniola and then claimed for Spain. Wynter fills the gap because for her there are no taboo topics. There are topics that are not explained in sufficient detail with sufficient recourse to the scholarly record. In Wynter (1997), one finds the theory of the “notion of the world,” which states that every cultural group has a specific idea of what “an increasingly more perfect” world looks like. Such a notion encourages the teacher, the students and the curriculum writers to grapple with problems of increasing complexity. The Wynterian Approach embraces the position taken by Rugg, the founder of the discipline of social studies, who call for a full issues-based social studies rooted in all of the problems of America are not done? Wynter expands this to issues-based social studies rooted in the problems of becoming human and the challenges of maintaining the practice of being human. For Wynter (McKittrick, 2015; Wynter, 2000), a central objective is to not allow anything humans do remain in the realm of historical dysconsciousness, a problem that goes too often unacknowledged with the problems that arise in dynamic complex intersecting globalism with its consistent search for easy answers that fail to show the real complexity of human-created situations. "The universal idea of humanity is not the same from the perspective of black history, Indian memories, or the memories of the population of Central Asia (Mignolo, 2006)." This statement is the point of the Wynterian Approach as it alludes to alternative cultural models, differing subjective understandings, liminality or shifting meanings about the

same event depending upon the positionality of the observer, and the embrace of the Black Studies Perspective which means all historically marginalized perspectives as "black" means "silenced and non-white".

Reconceptualist Thinkers in Social Studies Education

A group of scholars exist, who will be discussed in chapter 2, whose work can be grouped in as “the literature of counternarrativity.” These scholars are reconceptualists within social studies education. These scholars work falls into several disciplines – Social Studies Education, Cultural Geography, Curriculum Studies, Black Studies, Legal Studies, American Studies, Urban Education, Cultural Studies. Their work coalesces around a common theme of demystifying what Mills (1997) called “the racial contract” that since the time of 1492 has set the terms for European dominance in defining the non-European people of the world. The work of these scholars coalesce around an ethical human praxis of counternarrativity – a search to obliterate miseducation through a research-driven academic agenda for social justice. Professor King’s (2015) “epistemological annihilations” are Woodson’s (1933) “mis-education” is Fanon’s (1952) “aberration of effect” is what Bourdieu calls “symbolic violence” are harmful concepts that exist in textbooks, the most common tool used to perpetuate miseducation in US schools in general, and Texas schools in particular, to transmit dominant partial narratives as universal truth. The work of these reconceptualists share three commonalities:

1) The common theme of these scholarly works is to demystify how the racial contract of interlocking dominance narratives operates through careful deconstructive research.

These works explain the typical and present ways of understanding historical narratives through a lenses of dominance as pertains to the following: social studies education canon, pedagogy of social studies, historical narratives about a historical figure, historical event or historical epoch;

2) The common theme of these scholarly works is that they deconstruct a significant social studies event, as defined by the dominance narrative, using the dominant modes of research as pertains to acceptable sources of data for the dominant historical narrative of a particular historical event, historical figure or historical epoch or the pedagogy of social studies;

3) The common theme of these scholarly works is that they provide a well-researched academic work evaluates the dominant narrative and then provides a carefully argued academically acceptable, according to the dominant rules of research, counter-narrative of a particular historical figure and/or historical event and/or historical epoch or the pedagogy of social studies.

Scholars who are grouped as reconceptualists tend to focus a part of their work on counter-narrativity are: Woodson, DuBois, D. Aldridge, Derrick Bell, Anthony L. Brown & Keffrelyn D. Brown, A. Brown K. Brown & Heilig, D. Carlson, Mary L. Dudziak, Diane Hess, Joyce E. King, L. Reddick, Ellen E. Swartz, David Lowenthal; King &

Swartz; Seixas; Wineburg; VanSledright, and Howard Zinn . Their work provides examples to clarify this grouping. Their work compliments Wynter yet they still overlook the contested space created by Wynter's central question: What does it mean to be human?

The three key tenets of the reconceptualist scholars in social studies education will be examined here. Description of the presentation of dominant narratives is typical of the social studies curriculum scholarship. Wynter's scholarship challenges the comfortable duality of master narrative/dominant/native cultural model discourse and counter-narrative/alternative cultural model. Wynter's scholarship goes farther or "beyond." Before examining Wynter the works of scholars in the reconceptualists group will be presented with a description of what they do.

The first is that this work seeks to demystify how harm is manifested by dominance. These counter-narrative scholars do something that is ingenious in that they through their individual works show how typical ways of understanding social studies scholarship across the social studies disciplines and in the teaching of social studies disciplines are perpetuated and have been perpetuated. These scholars show that there is not just one dominance narrative but multiple dominance narratives as each master narrative or dominant discourse or hegemonic discourse morphs to fit a particular discipline. They let us know that the master narratives are rooted in European perceptions of how the world works best, in general, for people of European descent. Through their

counter-narrative scholarship these scholars unmask the typical way of teaching dominance narratives at all levels of public institutional education at the primary level, secondary level, and college level. These counter-narrative scholars provide the public with a catalogue of ignored images of non-Europeans (people of American Indian/African/Asian descent) that have been left out and, therefore, attempt to obliterate the historical presence of the any group not viewed as actively leading in the story or with the potential to actively lead at some point. Note that counter-narratives include images that are pictures/graphics, but also oral descriptions and written descriptions by the non-Europeans of their own lived reality that contest European dominance narratives, and counter-European narratives that contest the European master narrative in law, theology, and social studies disciplines.

Some scholars coined terms to describe the typical way of teaching and understanding the European master narrative as relates to the psychological and physical welfare of not only non-Europeans but also the Europeans themselves. Woodson (1933) terms this “miseducation.” Du Bois (1935) terms this “propaganda.” Mills (1997) terms this “the racial contract.” King (2015) terms this “epistemological annihilation.” Other scholars, Dudziak (2013), and King and Swartz (2014), focus on the intentional and unintentional harm done to students only taught in their public school classrooms the European master narrative view of the world and non-European peoples. Another group of counter-narrative scholars, Wineburg (2000) and VanSledright (2011), center their

work around how social studies skills are taught in the public schools with a focus on student development of social studies skills.

This work also seeks to deconstruct a significant social studies and historical event. Dennis Carlson (2013) for example examined the misuse of Rosa Parks . Aldridge (2006) evaluated the hypocritical sanitizing and transformation of Martin Luther King, Jr from an engaged constitutional democrat into a safe non-threatening relatively passive historical figure . Bell (1980), Hess (2008), and Dudziak (2014) all examine the typical trope of the Brown v. Board of Education United States Supreme Court decision as total victory for democratic values when in fact this trope leaves out a lot of uncomfortable, social and political realities of continued abuse of non-European Americans and resistance to the implementation of constitutional values by Americans of European descent as related to their fellow Americans of African descent, Native American descent, and Asian descent..

These scholars critique the dominant research rules of their social studies discipline to evaluate a particular instance of the implementation of the dominance narrative as pertains to a specific significant social studies event. These scholars, however, go a step farther, and develop a logical counter-narrative that then stands alongside the dominant narrative as co-terminus acceptable valid scholarship in a variety of social studies fields.

These scholars include Seixas (1993) who examines the development of historical consciousness in different and competing European communities. Dudziak (2004) and Bell (1980) both offer explanations of the Brown case and counter-narratives by resituating the Brown decision in different social and political and economic circumstances. Zinn (2009) offers up a more complete account of Columbus by including the perspective of the Indios exploited by Columbus and the child laborers abused by Columbus. Arguments are made by the scholars Anthony L. Brown & Keffrelyn D. Brown (2010) and Heilig, Brown & Brown (2012) about the presentation racism and racial violence in social studies textbooks and standards.

These three tenets of the reconceptualists in social studies education are created by pointing out that this new information exists as a coherent narrative, social studies scholars posit a counter-narrative that challenges the already existing dominant narrative and so allows for a new more complete and complex picture of events to emerge. This prompts a re-interpretation of the dominant narrative with respect to the new counter-narrative and so the existing historical thinking and historical consciousness that flowed from the unchallenged dominant narrative, while still persisting and existing, is nonetheless found to be lacking in veracity. The new counter-narrative now exists as new point of reference for scholarship. This is the duality. The gap that Wynter's scholarship fills in the social studies is the next step, as she challenges this duality in social studies

scholarship that explores the questions of what made it possible for particular histories and narratives to prevail.

Where does Wynter fit within the Social Studies?

The guiding question for Wynter is: What does it mean to be human? This question serves as a guide because she derives it from the momentous split created by the voyage of Columbus in 1492 that landed by mistake in the Caribbean islands as the seminal event that touched off the global capitalistic cannibalism by the Europeans of the world. Spain's aggressive absorption of the Caribbean followed by the quick deaths of the indigenous inhabitants would lead to the massive forced relocation of millions of Africans to the Caribbean islands, South America, and North America. The historian Michael Taussig (1986) discusses how the sheer magnitude of death and destruction brought upon Africans and indigenous peoples during Spanish colonization has no rational explanation. Taussig elucidates a point in Wynter's work (1984) – to move beyond the “standardized rational explanation” because such an explanation only serves to canonize and encourage the massive exploitation and murder of people in the name of profit. The explanation that Wynter demands in this instance and every other instance like this is always nuanced in word choice, rich in historical, geographic, psychological, political, sociological, linguistic details. Her social studies is the way that Harold Rugg, the founder of the field, envisioned with her rigor and comparative critical manner.

Wynter is powerful because she seeks to uncover how ideas are constructed. This idea of constructedness is alluded to by Henry Louis Gates (1988) when he wrote of the construction of the “New Negro” he talked about that which was “artificially formed (p.130).” The point he made in this 1988 article was that Blacks had to generate a new vision of themselves in response to an overwhelmingly imbalanced representation of themselves as “Sambos” for over 300 years. The “Sambo” construction was so prevalent that it became the accepted normative image of Blacks by Whites in the United States. Gates, like Wynter, proceeded to explain the “fiction” of the “New Negro” in literary terms, alongside the “sign of lack”, a psychological term from Lacanian psychoanalysis that represents a permanent gap that cannot be filled. Gates scholarship presented a viable, detailed, closely argued counter-argument to refute the damage done to Blacks by the “Sambo” image in the time of the early 1900’s down to the present time. Gates’ work served then, also, as a piece of social justice, as it was meant to correct an historical harm done to African Diaspora humans. Gates work opens the door to the idea and necessity of African Diaspora scholars using their work to define and redefine the lived experiences of Blacks throughout the world. African Diaspora people had been enslaved for over 300 years in the Western Hemisphere and usually they were kept voiceless.

In her project of providing a deep alternative cultural narrative, Wynter advocates the scholarly excavation of all normative cultural narrative. The Columbus narrative that Wynter uses as a touchstone in her work does three things: 1) The narrative shows how

dominant Spanish opinion was controlled by the Catholic Church; 2) The narrative shows how the Columbus discovery subverted the Catholic Church and empowered the Spanish state; 3) The narrative illustrated the unintended outcomes of colonization on the lives of what will be millions of people born and unborn due to a given set of ideas that were rarely challenged. In the Columbus narrative Wynter illustrates how all of us are trapped in the same box of ideas. What is important is what one does with these ideas. The problem for Columbus was that he was essentially stuck in his world, that of Catholic Spain and Portugal, that had undergone some 700 years of religious war with Islam for control of the Iberian peninsula. Columbus was hemmed in by a Catholic worldview that demanded he believe that the world extended only to a given point then the world became uninhabitable. What is notable here is that Wynter points out the complexity of Columbus by explaining that he had been a sailor for Portugal on slavetrading trips to El Mina, a Portuguese slavetrading station, that was below a point called Cape Bojador, a point on the West African coast that the Catholic Church had for centuries insisted was below the point of human inhabitability and ought to have been underneath the water. This bit of information about Columbus is terrifically important because it demonstrates what urged him to believe that he could sail in west to get to Asia in the East. What Wynter does is she capably explains Columbus' logic using his journals which she translated from Spanish herself. Note the depth of scholarship in language, geography, and psychology that Wynter employs to offer a full explanation that is beyond

“the standardized explanation” of Columbus was a great and brave explorer (Wynter 1997, 1995).

What made this alternative cultural narrative not only plausible but possible for Wynter to research and construct? Why did she do it? Wynter’s scholarship accepts no concept, idea, or fact at face value. There can be no human made knowledge that is ever considered to be whole, because humans are partial and imperfect creatures. Wynter’s concept of the “sociogenic principle” which she derived from Fanon’s concept of “sociogeny” makes it quite clear in that she states that humans live and learn about themselves based upon the messages they receive about themselves from other humans who make the societies in which they live. So, for Wynter, the very “facts” that constitute any argument are necessarily suspect. Trouillot in his essay, “Good Day Columbus” makes a striking point that facts are determined purely by the circumstances that surround those facts and then by who consumes those facts (Trouillot, 1990). Wynter (1992) in *Do Not Call Us Negros* foresaw this problem that plagues the creation of any social studies narrative in her remarks about the Kongo interactions with Portugal in the 1400’s wherein she shows how these two cultures viewed the perception of the term “black” differently which in turn heavily influenced the wide gap in interpretation of actions. This problem of humans being part a particular culture that they take with them is one of cultural diffusion with a twist. That twist emerges from this variation on Wynter’s foundation question: “What does it mean to be human?” and recalibrated in this question:

“Do all humans misperceive their own personal and necessarily limited partial knowledge of the world as comprising the worldview of the entire world?” The answer that Wynter finds and attempts to counteract is an affirmative. However, as in the case of the nascent diplomatic relations between the King of Portugal and the King of Kongo, she does show how the King of Kongo did communicate his cultural understanding to the Portuguese while the Portuguese not only ignored the Kongolese cultural outlook but did not attempt to clarify their own. This is an instance of arrogance that was normal for Western Europeans in their political, economic, and social dealings with Africans. Wynter writes about just such a series of situations in *The Hills of Hebron* (1962), her only novel.

In *The Hills of Hebron* Wynter (1962) sets forth a multivalent world in which multiple narratives are in play simultaneously. Each narrative is open to an interpretation that is dependent on the group and/or person engaged in making sense of the events in a given moment. An important finding is that all narratives are interpreted in an ex post facto sense. That means that every narrative is tagged as normative/dominant and/or alternative/subordinate dependent upon the group or person engaged in interpreting and fitting the narrative into some larger series of events. Another finding that Wynter makes is that in some way all narratives counter one another. This is the strength of what I refer to as the Wynterian Approach – it exposes the lie of any discourse that claims to be hegemonic and/or essential and beyond questioning its veracity. To restate another way, Wynter takes the sociological work of Cox (1948) and Wallerstein (1996) in world

systems theory and states that no fixed center no fixed semi-periphery no fixed periphery exists because a narrative must always be placed into a context by an interpellant who has her/his own rhizomically accreted worldviews that are never truly fixed. So a “fact” for Wynter is never just a fact that can go unchallenged, because one can always do research and show how the confluence of social studies are available for both the alternative cultural models and the normative cultural models to be heard, because all who create these models are humans who deserve to be heard. In the Wynterian Approach, the scholar will be using a lens that moves the scholar to seek expose scholarship that is culturally inauthentic because the scholarship fails to delve deeply enough into the components that created the current inauthentic situation; this is liminality, which is a space of constant change that Wynter (2006, 2000, 19995, 1992[1990]) encourages us to embrace.

Wynter (1995), however, goes farther when in the course of explaining the ideas that provided the hegemonic discourse for the construction of Columbus’ schemata, she explicates the theology/philosophy of the Catholic dogma and how this dogma evolved into new outlooks that carried over into the Renaissance, down into the 1800s and 1900s into the current capitalist world we all inhabit today. Wynter never forgets to detail and delineate where African Diaspora people fit into this evolving worldview. First she illustrates that Columbus in formulating his plan to sail west to arrive in the East commits “transumption,” a term that means to “retain” old ideas to link to new ideas so that new

ideas appear to be derived from “traditions (Wynter 1997, p.152).” Columbus believed it could be possible to sail west because he had sailed beyond Cape Bojador which had been deemed for centuries by the Catholic Church as the point of no return. In Columbus’ mind, he reasoned that if the Catholic Church had been mistaken about the Grace of God in allowing these non-Catholic regions to be above the water then could there be other earthly things that were explicable in terms of God’s Grace yet unrevealed. If so, then the Catholic binaries of “habitable/uninhabitable” and “heaven/earth” and “blessed/damned” and “celestial/terrestrial” might have not fully been revealed. Wynter is very careful to note that Columbus maintained his reasoning within the bounds of orthodox Catholic dogma and never questioned the veracity of the Catholic Church dogma but simply whether all revelations about the habitable world had been made apparent by God to man (Wynter, 2000, 1997, 1995).

It is from this point that Wynter (1995) becomes more brilliant with her linkages of Columbus’ struggle with Catholic Church dogma to shifts in the relative power of the Catholic Church and the state power of Spain to what Du Bois postulated was “the color line.” Wynter argues that “the color line” existed back in the 1400s by linking the plight of Black Americans and African Diaspora people at the 1892 Chicago World’s Fair. Wynter argues that “the color line” was the social, political, economic, and geographic equivalent of the Catholic Church’s medieval metaphysical geography of the habitable/uninhabitable zones of the Earth. At the Chicago World’s Fair, a special

women's exhibit was permitted in a building designed by a White female architect that invited middle class White women to show off their contributions. Black middle class women took exception to being ignored and protested and succeeded in gaining some participation (Wynter, 1997). Ida B. Wells, the noted Black female journalist wrote a pamphlet of protest against the entire World's Fair called, *The Reason Why the Coloured American Is Not in the World's Columbian Exposition*. Frederic Douglass, who was attending the World's Fair as the delegate for Haiti, wrote that: "As if to shame the Negro, the Dahomians are here to exhibit the Negro as a repulsive savage" (Trachtenberg 1982). The "color line" proved to have very little flexibility as that line of blessed/damned created by the Catholic Church and accepted by Columbus as Truth.

With Wynter, the interplay of ideas from varying disciplines so clearly explained demonstrates how the social studies would be enriched by adding her to the reconceptualization of the social studies education. Du Bois in his 1898 article, "The Study of the Negro Problem", discussed many of his concerns with social studies education being capable of fully embracing of African Diaspora scholars and the plurality of viewpoints that humans of African descent represent. Du Bois (1898), like Wynter, laid out a clear conception of the parameters of the argument. He argued that the Negro problem was actually a series of interlocked problems that had their genesis in the way in which the Negro was brought to this country and by extension to the Western hemisphere. He argued that the first significant psychological break for Whites and

Blacks came when under British colonial law a distinction was made between White and Black indentured servants condemning Blacks to life-terms of enslavement. Such a break broke what had been a natural affinity between White indentured servants and Black indentured servants and poor free Whites and poor free Blacks as they normally intermingled and did produce children. Du Bois further argued that for Blacks they were intentionally economically deprived and as such they had gained no mental conditioning concerning how to operate when freed as free individuals in a society. It is at this point, that Du Bois does in fact explain that in 1898 the majority of Blacks were absolutely illiterate and that only a few had had any formal schooling and even fewer had a full liberal arts education. He continued his criticism of the conditions in which all Blacks were forced to live due to intentional acts by Whites to humiliate Blacks. Du Bois encouraged Blacks to get their educations and to help other Blacks do this too; however, he consistently explained that Blacks live under “peculiar social environment” that seeks to degrade them everyday unrelentingly for the way they look, the way they talk, the way they walk, the way they live. This concern with how Blacks look would be echoed in Gates’ 1988 article, “The Trope of a New Negro and the Reconstruction of the Image of the Black.” Gates effectively used pictures from the early 1900s to illustrate how Blacks sought to control their images presented to the world. Gates noted that a concern with “features of this new Negro” meant that hair, skin color, mouth shape and lip size were especially important.

The unrelenting arguments made that degrade African Diaspora humans were discussed at length by Wynter in her 1984 Jamaica Journal articles, “New Seville and the Conversion Experience of Bartolomeo de las Casas”. In both of these articles, Wynter painted a broad yet closely argued expose that links the landing of Columbus in the Caribbean with the eventual exploitation of the indigenous Taino, who lived on the islands, and the way that their exploitation was modified and eventually replaced by the importation of African slaves. In both of these articles Wynter spoke of transformations that occurred in Bartolomeo de las Casas, Spanish law covering the indigenous people, and the importance of profits at the expense of human dignity. Bartolomeo de las Casas was a beneficiary of Columbus’ voyages in that he inherited an encomienda from his father, who had been one of Columbus’ confidants. De las Casas made a profit from his encomienda yet he became horrified at how horribly his fellow encomiendero mistreated the “Indios” who had to work for them. Because of this, he became the first man to convert to the priesthood in the Spanish Caribbean colonies. He kept his land but chose to use it to help the “Indios”; however, he became convinced that the “Indios” were human too and should not be exploited. As a result he petitioned the King of Spain to hear his case to save the King’s soul and was invited to argue against Sepulveda, the royal historian and believer in “the colour line.” Sepulveda argued that the “Indios” were born savage and beyond the salvation of God and as such had no right to live freely when their savagery made them naturally unable to make rational decisions about God and how to live right. De las Casas argued that the “Indios” were not savage but rather lived

according to the logic of their reason and as such could not be expected to live as Spaniards with Spanish reasoning and morality. Given this, the “Indios” could be taught to learn to become like Spaniards but should absolutely not be exploited through over work and torture (Barreto, 2013, p.140 – 171). Wynter (1995) noted that De las Casas made the first case for “postmodern relative reasoning” from a Catholic perspective while Sepulveda’s innately savage and damned for life argument was the one that actually weakened the ability of the Catholic Church to intervene on behalf of the “Indios” or any other peoples being exploited who were viewed to be on the wrong side of God and morality. The final transformation would come from De las Casas who argued further that Africans ought to be enslaved as they were accustomed to the harsh work in the hot sun due to their normative geography. As a result of De las Casas’ plea, the King did not put an end to the *encomienda* system but rather suggested strongly that the *encomienderos* treat their “Indios” with more Christian compassion and that licenses were sold for the exclusive right to import Africans, which quickly increased the number of Africans being shipped to the Caribbean and increased the competition between Portugal, Spain, England, France, the Netherlands, and Sweden to gain a chunk of the African slavetrade. Wynter, like Du Bois, made a full interdisciplinary social studies argument and allows the facts to speak for themselves while she pointed out the ironic outcomes that will lead to full on plantation agriculture in the Caribbean and in North and South America, which would ultimately condemn humans of African descent to 400 years of complete exploitation in the Americas and in Africa, though of a different kind.

The examination of the plantation was a subject taken up by Wynter in her 1971 article, "Plot and Plantation," in *Savacou*. In examining the plantation, she asserted that the plantation system actually spread from the Caribbean to North America. Furthermore, she argued that the plantation placed the Caribbean and the African in the market system as adjuncts. In terms of Oliver Cox's development of capitalism thesis cum Wallerstein's world system's theory, the Caribbean entered the capitalist system as a raw material producer and, hence, was located on the periphery from this inception moment. The fact of being on the periphery of capitalism meant that modernizing forces were not quick to come to the Caribbean because the rural system of slave labor and later peasant labor provided by the freed Blacks worked best to keep profits high for the owners of the land. Another important point in this article was the humanist element in the article that Wynter injects when she explained the reasoning of the exploited peasant laborers as opposed to the logic of the owners. A clear distinction was made between the "use value" argument of the laboring peasants and the "exchange value" argument of the landowners. Although the peasant labor force was most likely not acquainted with Marx, the "use value" they advocated meant that the humans in the community came before profits were to be made. Under "exchange value" the life of a peasant was worthless when that life interfered with turning a profit for the landowner. Wynter then expands these arguments by stating that "exchange value" led to not believing what one saw. For example, the planter who gave the African slave and later the peasant a plot of land for personal use only did so to maximize his profits. On the opposite end, for the African slave and the

African peasant laborer, the plot of land meant the ability to demonstrate to the goddess of Earth gratitude through good usage that helped bring nourishment to the entire community. Wynter argued that both of these groups lived inside their own worlds of logic yet the landowners did not respect nor bother to learn about the world of the Africans and dismissed their thoughts as useless.

Wynter's primary question is: What does it mean to be human? This question assumes that humans actually do ask this question to humans who will answer this question. Wynter shows how this question is one that is enacted through human behaviors and speech in texts, commerce, government, and all social relations. From a historical outlook, which is one aspect of social studies, Wynter argues that only real in depth research can truly open the door to more fully answering the dilemma of who is human. By examining the voyage of Columbus, Wynter brings in the entire world and so a simple historical question becomes a true social studies question because the disciplines of geography, sociology, economics, psychology, and anthropology are brought into play. The Columbus voyage as Wynter shows was not just about a European discovering new land, but it was about a man who was a complex creature that carried in his head definite habits about how the world worked and he would only refer to those habits to the exclusion of any other habits from foreign cultures he came across (Wynter, 1994). The intellectual stakes for social studies education, in this case, are that any number of previously accepted ways of thinking how the social studies canon must be composed are

seriously questioned for their scholarly completeness. Wynter effectively eliminates all categories in favor of one – that of being fully human. Any scholarship that does not adequately tackle that category must be lacking in ethics. For Wynter each human remains free to choose how she/he sees and situates herself/himself with one important stipulation: Every human has the inherent right to choose as many or as few categories of being human as long as she/he is made aware of the multiple ways of being. This is how a scholarly historical consciousness ought to be built. Wynter suggests that humans ought to have the opportunity to encounter and engage with the messiness that is social studies because nothing humans have done is actually sacred or beyond reproach; these are Wynter's concepts at play: alternative cultural model, the sociogenic principle and the Black Studies approach (Wynter, 1992).

The Wynterian Approach is effective for Texas History because it insists that Texas, or rather, those who write the Texas History curriculum at the fourth and seventh grade levels must take a broader approach to the topics – social studies data - with which students must have the opportunity to grapple. The globalizing society in which we all now live is one that does not permit an exit into a simplified, mono-cultural, single causality reality. Texas History must become a repository of many particulars within constantly shifting simultaneously existing universals that create a sustained challenge to perpetuated dominant narratives that have been in place since Columbus wrote in 1492 about the Taino as obviously good slaves and not having any weapons of any

consequence. Texas History, then, must deal openly with how different groups analyze and interpret one another – differing co-existing and co-equal subjective understandings from a standpoint of all inhabitants of the Earth are human and have a human right to have their voices heard and to live without being plundered and debased. Imagine how such an addition to the Texas History curriculum would force textbook companies to re-imagine and construct history textbooks. From that would flow numerous new ethical and moral outlooks that normally get excused or ignored – especially around the presentation of violence as reasonable action for self-described superior humans against their natural subordinates.

The Wynterian is important to social studies education because she advances the discipline to a new level. The broad question around which she revolves her research is: What does it mean to be human? This is the profound question because too often this is a question that never even enter consciousness of the researcher, the teacher, or the student save for in a biology class. Wynter takes an ostensibly scientific question and applies it to the social studies because this question helps explain the centuries of dicey interactions between groups of humans and then, in particular, the intentionally intensely brutal treatment both physically and psychologically of humans and peoples of African descent, Blacks. Wynter rejects cruelty which is a rejection of the golden rule in the practice of being human. To reject cruelty is to reject intentional and dysconscious abuse in everyday human activities and in things that humans produce like laws, curricula, constitutions, art

and entertainments. Very important to the Wynterian Approach is that the scholar employing must be ready to accept contingency and indeterminacy as Wynter explicitly rejects essential dominant explanations. To Wynter the “sociogenic principle” can be opened to accept endless “subjective understandings” constructed by humans from their specific lived experiences and research, because each of these humans belongs to a society who did experience the same abuses and joys and contingencies. The expressions of these societies constitute alternative cultural models that each pose a challenge to any native cultural model which is actually a falsely disguised local culture encroaching on another cultural space of creation and safety. Wynter lays out a model for social studies education that infinitely “liminal” and recognizes that each instance of change for any group must be expressed by them or that expression must be facilitated by someone interested in doing so who has the necessary training in reading dominance discourses and methods and mitigating their always distressing and demeaning harm. For Wynter the research is always constant and it will always be necessary to re-read and re-read because as she is well aware the circumstances of all initial engagements are contingent upon factors specific to that moment yet the one stubborn persistence she notes is that of a general denigration of all things and peoples deemed African and/or Black but she vows to never allow this to be reason to not continually striving to practice being human and supporting all other humans in their humanity (McKittrick, 2015; Wynter and Smith, 2000; Wynter, 2006, 2003, 2000, 1997, 1995, 1992[1990], 1984, 1970, 1969, 1968, 1962).

An example of future research that could put the Wynterian Approach to use would be to examine the area of Blacks and Mexicans and Afro-Mexicans in Texas History. Gerald Horne (2005), the historian, in his examination of Blacks and Mexicans and Afro-Mexicans in the time of the Mexican Revolution of the early twentieth century offers a rich world of interconnections. He urges an examination of local lives along the borderland where the United States deployed large numbers of Black soldiers to keep a White supremacist United States safe from invasion and contamination. The irony of the situation is rich yet it provides a chance to research the everyday sensibilities of local Black families as they interacted with Mexicans and Mexican-Americans, Blacks and Whites in what was a borderland region. Wallerstein would call this a periphery region next to an outland area.

Chege Githoria (2008), the sociologist, offers yet another way of examining the lives of these peoples but in Mexico. He argues that Spain did import its culture along with Africans for slave labor. He argues that the Casta system the Spanish put into place was meant to measure how close to whiteness and perfection the Indios and Negros/Africans had become through marriage to Whites/Europeans/Spaniards and people with some degree of Whiet blood. For Githoria, the Negros chose to articulate a powerful yet fiercely private alternative cultural model of “Black pride” that did and does preserve the history of the various Afro-Mexican communities across Mexico. The official culture of Mexico, the native cultural model, used its considerable resources to

construct an official culture that is officially Mestizo – the marriage of Indio and Spanish cultures while ignoring the African culture that is definitely a part of Mexico's heritage.

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY and METHODS

Wynter and Method of Historical Analysis

In this chapter I discuss the conceptual arguments around the analysis of historical text and sites of memory. This section provides a brief overview of the conceptual study of historical memory within texts and sites of memory. Also, I lay out the methods employed in this study to employ using the work of Sylvia Wynter to deconstruct the master narrative Texas icon Stephen F. Austin.

This is the methodology section. In the methodology section I propose to answer these questions: 1) What have scholars said about examining texts and textbooks? 2) What have scholars said about the production of public cultural memory? These two main questions connect to the ways in which school curriculum contributes to the construction of public cultural memory. These two questions overlap and have theoretical implications for my proposal as to why Sylvia Wynter's Wynterian Approach should be included as a key part of the social studies education canon. I will tackle this in the application portion of the methods section.

Conceptual Meanings of Texts and Sites of Memory

What have scholars said about examining texts: textbooks, museums, and sites of public memory? For this question, I draw on the work of scholars that theorize the

importance of examining textbooks, museums, and sites of public memory as part of our material culture. These are all texts in that they are the result of a simultaneous yet neither synchronous nor wholly divergent tangents of the dominant discourses and subordinate discourses that serve as signifiers in society. These are all texts that are rhizomic (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987) in that they can be attached to other memories shaped by the discourses of curricular and extra-curricular, for-profit and non-profit, private and public, institutional and informal, to make meaning for the individual and groups to which an individual chooses to associate (Apple, 1976). Material culture is always subject to social interpretation for meaning.

Ian Hodder (1994) theorized about interpreting documents and material culture, while making many suggestions that do prove helpful in the analysis of texts and textbooks. Hodder suggests that there are two types of documents - records and documents - that the scholar must differentiate as these documents serve different purposes. Records tend to be formal and official - bureaucratic and usually more difficult for the researcher to receive access to study. Documents tend to be prepared for personal reasons and require that the researcher determine a somewhat reliable context in which to place the document so as to interpret its intent and meaning with more reliable degree of accuracy. Both of these types of documents, Hodder asserts, are types of material culture and, as such, are created to do and perform a task.

Records, although they are bureaucratic, are intended to hold a quality of timelessness as the purpose of the record tends to be a manifestation of legislation. Here, a diversion begins as the researcher must determine whether the record was created at a given level for a given purpose at its level of creation. A modern example would be a marriage license created at the state level in the US but regulated by a federal government decision as to who is qualified to enter in the contract of marriage as a legally recognized couple that then must be recognized due to reciprocity between states. Here is a perfect example of what Hodder means when he suggests that the "text and context" of a record are "in continuous tension (p.394)."

Documents, because they are usually created to serve a personal function - diaries, letters, memos, fieldnotes - are usually quite dicey from which to distill a single unitary memory. Hodder suggests that the scholarship of Derrida is helpful to illustrate his point. Context is a process of constructing meaning after "reading and rereading a text (p. 394)." When a document is read and reread that re-interpretation must necessarily occur within a different context. If unstable meaning due to an unfixed context is a problem, Hodder suggests that the researcher must then strive to establish a "true meaning" and an "original" intent by doing sufficient research to create a "thick description" (Geertz, 1973, p. 5), that sufficiently links the origins of a document to a "specific historical context (p. 394)."

What is material culture? What does material culture do? Hodder states that material culture has to be apprehended and interpreted. Because material culture must be interpreted it, too, shares the attributes of both records and documents, it is inherently unstable, active, and transformational (p. 395). In order to interpret material culture, Hodder suggests several co-existing ways for the researcher to do this. None of these methods of interpretation, according to Hodder, are superior or inferior to one another, but rather they are researcher-dependent.

If material culture is researcher-dependent then the researcher, in part, generates the meaning for material objects that he/she studies. First, Hodder offers a hypothetical in which the researcher views himself/herself as part of a particular group then he/she could use a Marxist lens of interpretation to advantage his/her group. Second, Hodder offers a hypothetical in which the researcher views himself/herself as beholden to a particular ideology that should offer an interpretation whereby the researchers link to the dominant ideology is strengthened. Third, Hodder offers a hypothetical in which the researcher views himself/herself as a structuralist which opens up the possibility of multi-vocality; this means that the researcher finds multiple valid meanings. Hodder does not state whether the multiple co-terminous interpretations are to be rank-ordered or hold a particular value or are indeterminate in value (p. 396).

Hodder then asks the researcher to determine through keen observation whether there are any identifiable "rules of representation" and "rules of practice and evocation"

(p. 397). These rules are important because materials that require interpretation exist in a liminal space that is rich with associations of rigid meanings, official meanings, embedded meanings, practical knowledge, and cultural knowledge. Every one of these avenues of interpretation offer an equally valid path of contextualization for teasing out meaning. At the same time, every one of these paths of interpretation can trigger non-linear rhizomic associations such as judging the moral value of a particular piece of art or a public monument.

Hodder suggests that the researcher, in the end, must do the following. First, he/she must identify boundaries and contexts. Second, he/she must explain the similarities and differences to attempt to establish a potentially useable cross-cultural context, a common ground wherein all groups present believe they have an identifiably valid voice. Third, the researcher must apply the context to a specific desired goal. To establish and apply a context requires the use of Geertz's (1973, p.5) "thick description" because this method offers evidence that operates to link groups from widely variant cultural contexts in a non-lawlike way that permits each to find a complimentary way of belonging.

Anthony L. Brown and Keffrelyn D. Brown in their essays, "Silenced Memories" and "Strange Fruit Indeed" (2010), examine textbooks with the specific goal of determining how racial violence toward African Americans is depicted. Their studies are of importance to my proposal because their scholarship has direct bearing on inadequacies of official school curriculum, problems with traditional social studies

textbooks in public schools, and the creation of public cultural memory. Also, Brown and Brown (2010) examine Texas public school social studies textbooks. Additionally, articles by Vasquez Heilig, Brown and Brown (2012) as well as another by Anthony L. Brown (2010) on the subject of counter-memory, all examine the complicated intersections of race, ideology, curriculum as these inform the creation of educational spaces.

What do Brown and Brown (2010) suggest about interpreting textbooks that will be useful to guide me in my proposal? They suggest that to do a thorough job of textbook analysis, the researcher must first establish the fact of the inadequacies of traditional social studies textbooks. The inadequacies that they ferret out are those that deal with the exclusion of the viewpoints of given groups, such as African Americans, Native Americans, and Mexican Americans from textbooks. As such, all students cannot hope to overcome the wall of what Ellen Swartz (1982; 2007) calls the "master script." Scholars who examine the question of why curriculum and textbooks are inadequate to the task of educating a student body that is always increasing in racial diversity, ethnic diversity, class diversity, linguistic diversity and disability diversity – the historically marginalized and sometimes-erased humans - are Anyon (1982, 1981) and Apple (1983, 1978, 1976). A goal of the textbook scholarship of Brown and Brown (2010a, 2010b) is to establish a baseline along which one reasonably and reliably could measure whether the actual enactment of social justice to combat a long history of intentional educational

impoverishment has occurred by studying the content of Texas social studies textbooks. Social justice could be attained, they suggest, through the implementation of critical race theory and a study of cultural memory. Anthony Brown (2010) buttresses the argument of Brown and Brown when he suggests that the intentional educational impoverishment imposed by the dominant group in American society is being and has been combated through the work of Black scholars, who assert that humans of the African Diaspora have always had stories worth telling but these stories intentionally were not made available to all of American society. The actions of these Black scholars created a persistent counter-narrative to a dominant narrative that emphatically stated to Blacks that they had no worth and as such no place in society and no voice. Critical race theory, using the work of Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995), suggests that racial dominance by Whites is rarely, if ever, questioned directly or indirectly as an anti-democratic fact and an anti-social justice fact in textbooks. Moreover, this problem leads back to the problem of who teaches the diverse array of culturally different, racially different, linguistically different, and economically different children and their inadequate training to teach children unlike themselves as suggested by Joyce E. King in *Preparing Teachers for Cultural Diversity* (1997). In addition, Joyce E. King developed a theory of “dysconscious racism” that serves a foundational argument to critique curriculum and textbook exclusion of non-dominant voices. King argues that over time the dominant arguments that preach the exclusion of Blacks and other non-Whites eventually becomes a normative and unnoticed part of the many convergent discourses that, as Anyon (1981) and Apple (1976) states,

tacitly informs Americans of how the world works. In this model of how the word works, curriculum and textbooks are created to emphasize the place of total positivity of creation and intelligence of all people considered to be White and, therefore, worthy of having their every thought no matter how trivial entered into the public record as notable for public memory.

What Brown and Brown (2010) do that is especially effective is they first link their work to important scholars who have done similar studies. They suggest that by using the scholar Alridge (2006) that correct textbook analysis requires reading the literature, noting the themes, discussing the themes, and supporting the conclusions with examples. I propose to follow the examples set by Brown and Brown (2010a, 2010b), Vazquez Heilig, Brown and Brown (2012), A.L. Brown (2010). These scholars suggest that instances of violence toward African Americans must be studied and analyzed followed by a study of African American resistance to violence. Collectively they explain why African Americans and other non-dominant social groups believe they are marginalized in their social studies classes; a tip taken from the work Anyon (1981) and Apple (1976), who propose to study the enactment of social studies curriculum at the classroom level to find out how institutional harm is operationalized in discrete locations, which suggests that every location has both convergent and divergent links from any grand theory (Anyon, 1982) that proposes to explain all things. Brown and Brown explain why and how the achievement gaps that continuously harm and damn the development of African

American students by intentionally damaging their psyches are intentionally constructed. They question whether the official story of school districts offering a nurturing and inclusive multicultural curriculum that respects the contributions of all citizens in the US and their backgrounds. In doing this, Brown and Brown (2010a, 2010b), A.L. Brown (2010), and Vazquez Heilig, Brown and Brown (2012) extend the probing of inequalities-in-public-education scholarship of Anyon and Apple and that directly echoes the work of Wynter. This is what I propose to do in my study.

Ellen Swartz in three essays from 1992, 1993, and 2007 refers to the existence of a “master script” that handicaps the development of African American students and other students, because this “master script” serves to “miseducate” all students. Her work compliments that of Brown and Brown and Hodder in that she articulates a strong case that explains as to why some groups of people are silenced. Swartz (1992) points out that the debate is about emancipator scholarship gaining supremacy over the current hegemonic scholarship that maintains White supremacist, Eurocentric ideologies as normative (p. 341). Swartz points out that Sylvia Wynter (1990) points out that the “failure of educational systems is to equitably educate children across race, class, and gender.”

In her studies of social studies textbooks, Swartz (1992) finds that the problem exists of “heroizing yet decontextualizing” African Americans. This problem means that the few added African Americans are presented as exceptions who are not products of

their historical times (p.343). This problem implies that these few African Americans are so special that the majority of African Americans were, in fact, simply passive animals waiting to be herded.

Swartz in her 1993 essay about the problems with multicultural education addresses a problem of social justice in education. She observes that frequently White administrators speak about “sending those Black kids back to their neighborhoods,” because of a perception of Black kids being highly disruptive and anti-academic in demeanor. The link that Swartz makes is that such a modern attitude mirrors what is “actually taught through the curriculum and instructional materials in U.S. schools (p. 498).” This means that there is a consistent narrative of removal that exists in the attitudes of some White educators and the curriculum they are expected to enhance to be inclusive. Clearly this will not happen unless a concerted push is made to emplace an emancipator curriculum. What this implies about the use of textbooks is what Anyon asserts; textbooks are chosen by educational personnel who hold worldviews that by degree favor, disfavor, or are benign toward the educational development of students of varying racial, class, and ethnic backgrounds. Given this, the attitudes of teachers are very much a worthy subject of consideration when curriculum is enacted and operationalized in the classroom learning environment. Teacher worldview is very much a subject of public memory in that the exposures to which teachers have received throughout their youth, college, and adult years heavily shape the filters through which

they interpret the people in the world. The question is do teacher mentalscapes tend to do educational harm to children very much not armed for such vital combat for their own souls?

Hodder (1994), Brown and Brown (2010a, 2010b), A.L. Brown (2010), Vazquez Heilig, Brown and Brown (2012), King (1995, 1991), and Anyon (2008, 1982, 1981), all share these commonalities from varying angles. Each are aware of the importance of how every human is a social construct of her/his social surroundings. These scholars recognize that these environments shape that ways in which each human places himself/herself as both a member of a collective group and, in the case of the United States, as an individual citizen. These scholars, though pick up on problem of the danger of encouraging the development of mental slothfulness – a lack of the development of a mature analytical criticality – in what amounts to a normative cultural mode of everyday just not-doing due in part to societal gatekeepers who choose not to view other people not like them as lesser beings that themselves compounded by the fact that those humans viewed as lacking are placed in a position where they are less than likely to be able to effectively organize and develop a sustained counternarrativity that will support lasting counter-memories upon which to anchor a sustained view of the self as an independent historically grounded subject with views the public must consider. These scholars lay the groundwork for the exploration of the development of public cultural memory.

What have scholars said about the production of public cultural memory? For this question, I will examine the work of Pierre Nora, Richard Flores, Michel-Rolph Trouillot, David Thelen, Jean Anyon and Michael W. Apple. All of these scholars share a bend for seeking to demystify the creation of public memory to remove control of meaning-making from being totally a product of a dominant social narrative. These scholars attempt to make a real space for the public in public memory and so introduce the possibility of the shaping of an interpretation of any public memory site that does not silence the past voices of human contributors that are too often discarded and forgotten.

Nora (1989) asserts that memory in its current instantiation of complex merging environments are less secure in that memory has become simultaneously democratic and massified or accessible. The democratization and massification of memory mean that accessibility of memory stems from the fact that in a time when memory was exclusive, it was a time of mass undereducation undergirded by the dominant discourse that God had made a fixed place in the universe for all of God's creations. Note here that this God was only knowable through a sanctioned group of interpreters known as the clergy, who were could apprehend God through Latin and the written Word in the Bible. The clergy confirmed the order of society and thus sanctified this arrangement as beyond criticism as to criticize would be heretical and punishable by excommunication, the banishment from the community of believers, and/or actual death. Under such circumstances memory, public memory and with it historical consciousness, was governed and absolute.

Note the connection between Hodder and Nora exists because the public memory will be enacted very often through the creation of documents, written utterance, and through speech, oral utterance. Nora asserts that there multi-vocality and counternarratives could and did arise from within the clergy and from outside of the clergy, the laity, but only over time and only when a new interpretation arose within the just-right set of circumstances. The argument that Nora builds about the creation of sites of memory illustrates that he believes that public memory is the result of engagements between memory and history. To move Nora's argument from the airiness of high culture to the grounded of everyday life is what Hodder offers to Nora. Taken together these two European scholars allow the practical American scholar to place the creation of documents, such as textbooks and curriculum, in a milieu of everyday use and everyday accessibility.

Richard Flores (1998) asserts a construct of a memory-place, which is the embodiment of Hodder and Nora being grounded in everyday happenings – in this case Flores uses the Alamo, a popular yet contested public memory site. Flores adapts Nora's idea of a site of memory to his needs in that he argues that he seeks to find out how “collective memory is semiotically grounded (p.429).” By viewing a memory-place as set in symbols and language, Flores argues how he can detect human political, social, and economic practices rooted in how different groups choose to interpret the meanings and use of memory-places.

Flores uses the Alamo as an excellent example of how memory-place works. He first deploys Jacques LeGoff's definition of memory as "a particular group's understanding of the past (Flores, p. 432)." In this way Flores grounds his idea of memory-place in how a group utilizes a particular understanding of a public memory site to advance their own agenda – support a particular curriculum for a place. This ties back to Hodder's idea that meaning for any particular piece of material culture is always a contested place. Flores opines that the Alamo as a memory-place can be interpreted and experienced ethnically and ethnographically.

In experiencing the Alamo ethnically, Flores explains in his 1995 essay that the conflict about who would control the construction of the Alamo as an official site of public memory was between a Tejano woman and a White Texas woman. They both had great public respect but critically and crucially, Driscoll was a White Texan railroad heiress, who appropriated the construction of the Alamo as an official state tourist site to her own beliefs in the supremacy of White Texan individualism, rationality and capitalism. On the other side with the respect but without the ready case was Adina De Zavala, who articulated an inclusive view of the Alamo that respected the old Spanish legends, Mexican myths and White Texan heroism that co-existed. For De Zavala the Alamo was a place of restoration of the hope of building a true multicultural society. Driscoll's vision won out, because she was able to gain the tacit support of high Texas government officials. Extended in a practical direction, Flores lays a groundwork for an

examination of not only the Alamo, but also of other Texas public memory sites, such as the Texas State Cemetery, along with public memory mytho-historical sites that have entered the Texas social studies curriculum and Texas state-adopted textbooks in the mytho-histories of Stephen F. Austin, Sam Houston, and the augustness of the *Republic of Texas Constitution of 1836* as a true document embracing universal freedom for all Texans.

Flores in both of his essays argues that memory thinks of itself as complete and unassailable. This means that a view of dynamic multicultural wherein all groups can respectfully co-exist and claim the Alamo simultaneously is not preferred by people who are very certain that their outlook is complete and requires no refinements. Flores argues that at the Alamo one tends to find binary accounts of the good and the bad which effectively simplifies and jaundices preventing any real understanding of the Alamo and the actors as complex human beings.

Flores (2002) argues that humans create master symbols as ways of delinking specific sites from their true historical roots while paradoxically retaining the historical link in a mythologically pure form. This argument could be usefully retained to analyze curriculum and textbooks as everyday grounded sites of public memory by filtering them through an argument curriculum and textbooks become transformed into totemic symbols that self-perpetuate and, therefore, continuously self-define as purity myths, symbolic of

whiteness and capitalism, no matter how powerful the counter-narratives and counter-memories deployed to prevent such a hagiography from occurring.

Michel-Rolph Trouillot suggests in his 1990 essay, “Good Day Columbus,” that “the attempts to mythicize history often make it like answering a trivia game (p.5).” In his 1995 book he argues that “historical narrative is a bundle of silences (p.27).”

Trouillot argues that cultural interpretation is a question of degree, especially when one examines a problem geographically, one finds that too often oppositional groups of people co-occupied a territory and so their cultural practices and memories become amalgamated. If this is the case, what then is a researcher to do?

Trouillot suggests that a scholar must make an honest attempt to reveal the usually silenced groups who have been tagged as alternative cultures. In this way their alternative narratives can be present alongside the normative cultural narratives. Silencing usually means sanitizing history, unless the silenced voices receive an actual possibility of finding a voice to become known as co-terminus voices. Trouillot suggests along with Wynter that dehistoricized people can be re-inserted into history as meaningful actors and as co-equals who have their anchors restored. What would follow for public cultural memory would be a new instantiation of complexity. This would mean that ideally sites of public cultural memory along with school curricula and textbooks and teacher education would be rewritten to be actually and truly inclusive and perpetually critically.

A multi-vocality that could be grounded in Geertz's (1973) idea of "thick description" would ideally be one of a new series of co-existing alternative cultural models.

Historian David Thelen (1989) argues that memory is dysconscious and can be discerned through the actions and chosen semiotic deployments of a particular person or group. Thelen asserts that there are different types of memory some of which are deemed acceptable and others as unacceptable. This is how public memory sites are branded and gain support or fall into disrepair due to being ignored. Thelen suggests that narrators of stories assist the public in arranging their memories in the "correct way." Given this he further suggests that by extension teachers who are of an emancipator bend should very much hone their skills so as to be able to redirect memory in ways that are commensurate with social justice.

For the Texas social studies curriculum these arguments surrounding critical social theory, material culture, public memory, and rhizomic thinking create a basis for a truly rigorous social studies in the way Rugg (Carbone, 1977) the founder of social studies, intended, because under these circumstances social studies will be useful in creating citizens who are ready to be engaged in the building of a Texas that offers real opportunity for all humans. Most importantly to remember that there are no essentialisms that can be invoked, because it was through the imposition of absolutes that this mess of intentional exclusion and dysconscious harm came to exist (Wynter, 1994, 1984, 1967.)

Theory as a Way to Embrace Truth and Transform

When considering Wynter as a social studies scholar, the key to understanding the crux of her work is that she advocates embracing multiple views of any historical event. This means that traditionally a single dominant view of an historical event usually only advocates a single causality narrative that reflects the interests of those who dominate society. Wynter leads by example in that in order to get at a full understanding, a full “subjective understanding”, of any historical event or historical actor plus to avoid falling into the trap of miseducation – dogmatic support of a single dominant narrative – she advocates that one must seek out the silenced narratives, alternative narratives or counternarratives, that have usually received short shrift and have been effectively silenced because these discourses do not reflect the dominant narrative and challenge the veracity of the counternarrative. Wynter's project opens the opportunity for people, who want to know what the truth is, and who desire to transform their worldviews or not, for them to face the fact that truth is a multi-vocal, multi-pronged multi-textual, rhizomic series of narratives that occurred simultaneously. All of these narratives co-exist, contradict and complement one another. Most importantly these narratives were filtered through people - social animals - who sought to understand the world in which they lived so as to enrich their lives and gain a wholeness of understanding to transform themselves into full humans; this is an example of the “Black Studies Perspective” coupled with “liminality” at work. Wynter's driving question: What does it mean to be human? - is

effectively an excavation project that uses the tools of the sociogenic principle interchangeably and simultaneously. So central to Wynter is that she offers those who choose to take part in her social studies advance a choice to accept or not in whole or in parts while rejection of any part or acceptance of any part does not condemn the user to a loss of her/his status as a human being. Wynter ennobles scholarship and the scholarly work that produces it. The transformation here is that Wynter (1969, 1970, 1971, 1990) enlarges the definition of scholarly work to include those areas of creativity normally marginalized as primitive – dance, oral tradition (griots), atemporal ageographical synchronous hybrid thought (voodoo, *santaria*), pidgin English, Creole French. The dominant discourse of White supremacy, the normative cultural model, usually condemns as contemptible mimicry or casts on the rubbish heap by dismissing the creations made by humans as subhuman.

What, then, are the basic actions, the mechanics of what Wynter does? There are five basic actions of Wynter's mechanics – what I call the Wynterian Approach. These are the actions Wynter takes to evaluate each of her chosen topics of research.

Wynter (1995, 1992[1990]) identifies a topic and explains how we are taught to understand a particular topic – historical event/actor/problem in a particular way. The common way of understanding is through what Wynter identifies and explains as the native cultural model (NCM) or dominance discourse/dominance narrative. An example of this is Wynter's explanation of the common way of understanding the Columbus

discovery story. Here Wynter's works show that there are many convergent dominance narratives that could be used to enforce a given understanding of how the world works and "selects out" or "defines in" people as being human.

Second, Wynter (1995, 1992[1990]) deconstructs the common way of understanding – the NCM - by re-read the original sources in the case of the Columbus discovery story were Columbus' diaries and Spanish royal documents as well as contemporaneous original documents that commented on Columbus and his activities. The advantage of reading these documents is that they frequently identify human actors who are noticed to have no further voice in the common narrative. These voiceless human actors become a gap in the narrative which means that the entire story was not told. Wynter encourages broad research in many languages across disciplines to find what it means to be human.

Third Wynter (2006, 1995, 1992[1990]) then assembles the dominant narrative gap evidence from the identified silenced humans and the contemporaneous commentaries. By doing this Wynter constructs a counter-narrative rooted in the counter-memories of the silenced human actors. She finds their voices by doing tangential research that reads across disciplines. For example, she might examine later-written oral accounts of the event from colonized peoples under Spanish rule or she might examine artifacts left behind that can be read as texts or she might go examining related theological and juridical documents finding commentaries in Roman Catholic canon law. In the case of

the Columbus narrative the contemporaneous accounts of Bishop De las Casas, the Defender of the Indios proves invaluable. Also, the canon law works of De las Casas and Father de Vitoria and Father Sepulveda all throw light onto the contested terrain of religious and state conflicts concerning who is “selected out” or “defined in” as humans during the time of Columbus. When these are analyzed and assembled they represent a counter-narrative or alternative cultural model (ACM) that stands alongside the already existing and persistent dominance narrative/NCM.

Fourth Wynter (2006, 2003, 2000, 1997, 1995, 1992[1990]) has a purpose just as the purpose of the dominance narratives were to support and justify the actions of the dominant group in their dealings with other humans who were not considered to be like themselves. Wynter’s purpose is to establish the criteria by which groups that had been intentionally marginalized (IHMGs) evaluated themselves as humans. This is done in Wynter’s work with her references to the work of other scholars within and outside of social studies whose work compliments her practice of being human. Wynter encourages the building of complimentary bridges between disciplines as all knowledges are human creations and the lessons of history show that shutting of any group from knowledge leads the harmful and cruel practices of miseducation.

Fifth, Wynter (2006, 2003, 2000, 1997, 1995, 1992[1990]) establishes a superordinate goal just as the dominant discourses did for their research. The superordinate goal of dominance narratives was to justify all actions by members of the

dominant group and their fellow travelers as justified by God and therefore blessed and forgivable. Wynter's superordinate goal is to establish what actions establish the practice of being human and so encourage others to act in ways consistent with supporting humanness. Here Wynter asserts that a rejection of cruelty that, therefore allows each human to exercise her/his/their equalitarian rights as citizens of a democratic society through the use of the Word (James 1992) – symbols, signs, artifacts, performances, oratory, hybrid creations – that articulate a particular way of being – a cultural self that co-exists alongside other cultures.

In chapter 4 and chapter 5 the Wynterian Approach will be applied to the examination of the Texas social studies curriculum, specifically by examining the Texas historical figure Stephen F. Austin. Texas State History textbooks will be examined from the 4th grade and 7th grade levels concerning their representations of Stephen F. Austin. After this two sites of public memory will be examined at the Texas State Cemetery and the Texas State Capitol as relates to Stephen F. Austin. These will show how the application of theory to the production of social studies knowledge in Texas History can be used to invigorate Texas History for the necessary mental flexibility required for 21st Century thinkers.

Methods

This is a qualitative study rooted in text analysis of textbooks and public memory sites. The purpose of the method section is to explain how I went about collecting data.

The second purpose of the methods section is to explain the theoretical perspectives that the scholar proposes to use to interpret the data. The guiding questions to put the methods section together are:

1) What does the scholar examine the four official Texas state-adopted instructional materials that are: one (1) fourth (4th) grade instructional material (weekly reader newspaper) and three (3) seventh (7th) grade instructional materials (textbooks) and the two public memory sites?

2) How does the scholar gather data from the four official Texas state-adopted instructional materials that are: one (1) fourth (4th) grade instructional material (weekly reader newspaper) and three (3) seventh (7th) grade instructional materials (textbooks) and the two public memory sites?

3) How does the scholar code the data?

4) How does the scholar develop themes that reflect a finding across the four official Texas state-adopted instructional materials that are: one (1) fourth (4th) grade instructional material (weekly reader newspaper) and three (3) seventh (7th) grade instructional materials (textbooks) and the two public memory sites?

5) How does the scholar analyze the data?

What follows will be a part that provides a description of two basic questions: 1) Why is Texas social studies important? 2) What will the scholar study in Texas social studies? In

addition there is a presentation of the state-mandated curriculum for Texas social studies at the fourth (4th) grade and seventh (7th) grade.

Description & Guiding Questions

Why is Texas History important? It is state-mandated by Texas Legislature then supervised by the Texas Education Agency (TEA). TEA sanctions the state-mandated curriculum, which drives the content of the state-adopted textbooks at fourth (4th) grade and seventh (7th) grade where Texas social studies is taught. The purpose of Texas social studies is to transmit values supposedly treasured by public memory.

What will the scholar study in Texas social studies?

I studied three topics within and among the four official Texas state-adopted instructional materials that are: one (1) fourth (4th) grade instructional material (weekly reader newspaper) and three (3) seventh (7th) grade instructional materials (textbooks) and the two public memory sites. The Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) adopted by the Texas Education Agency to begin in 2011-2012 covers the three topics and none of the public memory sites I propose to examine. The TEKS appear here to show just what I argue: that the TEKS need to be enhanced and clarified as these are the foundational guides used to build every social studies curriculum used in the state of Texas, which influences millions of young malleable minds and adults.

I study what the state mandates must be studied.

According to Chapter 113.15, Grade 4 TEKS (TEA, 2011):

(b) Knowledge and skills.

(2) History. The student understands the causes and effects of European exploration and colonization of Texas and North America. The student is expected to:

(E) identify the accomplishments and explain the economic motivations and impact of significant empresarios, including Stephen F. Austin and Martín de León, on the settlement of Texas.

(3) History. The student understands the importance of the Texas Revolution, the Republic of Texas, and the annexation of Texas to the United States. The student is expected to:

(A) analyze the causes, major events, and effects of the Texas Revolution, including the Battle of the Alamo, the Texas Declaration of Independence, the Runaway Scrape, and the Battle of San Jacinto;

(C) identify leaders important to the founding of Texas as a republic and state, including José Antonio Navarro, Sam Houston, Mirabeau Lamar, and Anson Jones;

(4) History. The student understands how individuals, events, and issues shaped the history of the Republic of Texas and early Texas statehood. The student is expected to:

(A) identify individuals, events, and issues during the administrations of Republic of Texas Presidents Houston, Lamar, and Jones, including the Texas Navy, the Texas Rangers, Edwin W. Moore, Jack Coffee Hays, Chief Bowles, William Goyens, Mary Maverick, José Antonio Navarro, the Córdova Rebellion, the Council House Fight, the Santa Fe Expedition, public debt, and the roles of racial and ethnic groups;

(5) History. The student understands how events and issues shaped the history of Texas during the Civil War and Reconstruction. The student is expected to:

(A) explain reasons for the involvement of Texas in the Civil War such as states' rights, slavery, sectionalism, and tariffs;

(B) analyze the political, economic, and social effects of the Civil War and Reconstruction in Texas.

According to Chapter 113.19, Grade 7 TEKS (TEA, 2011):

b) Knowledge and skills

(2) History. The student understands how individuals, events, and issues through the Mexican National Era shaped the history of Texas. The student is expected to:

(D) identify the individuals, issues, and events related to Mexico becoming an independent nation and its impact on Texas, including Texas involvement in the fight for independence, José Gutiérrez de Lara, the Battle of Medina, the Mexican federal

Constitution of 1824, the merger of Texas and Coahuila as a state, the State Colonization Law of 1825, and slavery;

(E) identify the contributions of significant individuals, including Moses Austin, Stephen F. Austin, Erasmo Seguín, Martín De León, and Green DeWitt, during the Mexican settlement of Texas; and

(F) contrast Spanish, Mexican, and Anglo purposes for and methods of settlement in Texas.

(3) History. The student understands how individuals, events, and issues related to the Texas Revolution shaped the history of Texas. The student is expected to:

(A) trace the development of events that led to the Texas Revolution, including the Fredonian Rebellion, the Mier y Terán Report, the Law of April 6, 1830, the Turtle Bayou Resolutions, and the arrest of Stephen F. Austin;

(B) explain the roles played by significant individuals during the Texas Revolution, including George Childress, Lorenzo de Zavala, James Fannin, Sam Houston, Antonio López de Santa Anna, Juan N. Seguín, and William B. Travis;

(C) explain the issues surrounding significant events of the Texas Revolution, including the Battle of Gonzales, William B. Travis's letter "To the People of Texas and All Americans in the World," the siege of the Alamo and all the heroic defenders who gave

their lives there, the Constitutional Convention of 1836, Fannin's surrender at Goliad, and the Battle of San Jacinto; and

(D) explain how the establishment of the Republic of Texas brought civil, political, and religious freedom to Texas.

(4) History. The student understands how individuals, events, and issues shaped the history of the Republic of Texas and early Texas statehood. The student is expected to:

(A) identify individuals, events, and issues during the administrations of Republic of Texas Presidents Houston, Lamar, and Jones, including the Texas Navy, the Texas Rangers, Edwin W. Moore, Jack Coffee Hays, Chief Bowles, William Goyens, Mary Maverick, José Antonio Navarro, the Córdova Rebellion, the Council House Fight, the Santa Fe Expedition, public debt, and the roles of racial and ethnic groups;

(5) History. The student understands how events and issues shaped the history of Texas during the Civil War and Reconstruction. The student is expected to:

(A) explain reasons for the involvement of Texas in the Civil War such as states' rights, slavery, sectionalism, and tariffs;

(B) analyze the political, economic, and social effects of the Civil War and Reconstruction in Texas.

The Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) all consistently call for “students [to] understand” the state-mandated social studies curriculum. A proposed

question for examination could be: What is meant by “understanding”? This term appears in Bloom’s Taxonomy and means a lower level, a basic level of grasping knowledge. Perhaps the term “understanding” in the social studies curricula could be better clarified as to intent with reference to the intent of the historic mission of social studies. Given this proposed definition of “understanding” a proposal could be made to later made to address this question.

A proposed social studies could encourage full student engagement by insisting that each student be challenged to compare and contrast her/his personal values against those of her/his peers and historic figures. Perhaps later the student could defend her/his reasoned position in an atmosphere of respectful harmony where the process of grappling with different intellectual positions is the goal rather than having all parties come to an agreement. The proposed process of grappling could encourage vigorous analysis and synthesis built up from basic comprehension up into increasingly complex understandings of events/places/people/groups. These could be the foundational currencies.

What instructional materials and sites of public memory sites were examined?

I examined the textbooks and public memory sites for what each states about a single topic: Stephen F. Austin. The sole topic is historical figure: Stephen F. Austin.

The four instructional materials – one 4th grade instructional material and three 7th grade textbooks along with the two public memory sites – The Bob Bullock Texas State History

Museum and the Texas State Cemetery will be examined with reference to the two topics below and the guiding questions.

1)Texas historical figure - Stephen F. Austin.

I propose to ask the following guiding questions about their presentation:

- 1) How is Stephen F. Austin presented in the state-adopted textbooks?
- 2) How is this used in terms of symbols? Are the symbols benign? Are the symbols iconographic? Does Stephen F. Austin's life get transformed into an iconic site of public memory? Is he represented as raced or racialized figures? [Proposed associations could be: White, male, patriot, frontiersman, warrior, bravery, courage, intelligence, freedom-fighter.]
- 3) How Stephen F. Austin's life positioned in relation to/in comparison to enslaved Blacks (people of African descent)? free Blacks? White Anglo-American settlers? In relation to Mexico, Mexico's government and government officials, Native Americans?
- 4) Is Stephen F. Austin presented as an ordinary "human" as defined in his lifetime and this time in which we live now or as an extraordinary trailblazer ahead of his time?
- 5) In each public memory site what references does Stephen F. Austin receive?

Data Collection and Analysis: Textbooks and Public Memory Sites

How does the scholar propose to gather data from each of the textbooks?

I examined the four (4) Texas Education Agency state-adopted Texas social studies instructional materials for the fourth (4th) grade and seventh (7th) grade. There are one fourth (4th) grade instructional material and three seventh (7th) grade textbooks. In each of the instructional materials I searched the glossary, the index, and features such as biographies and pictures to determine how the topics of Stephen F. Austin are presented to Texas social studies' students.

The title of the single Grade-4 instructional material is : 1) *Texas Studies Weekly* (2015) published by American Legacy Publishing, Inc.;

The titles of the three Grade-7 textbooks are:

- 1) *Texas History* (2015) published by Houghton Mifflin Harcourt;
- 2) *Texas History* (2015) published by McGraw Hill Education;
- 3) *Texas History* (2015) published by Pearson Education.

All of these instructional materials have ancillaries. At both, fourth (4th) grade and seventh (7th) grade, the same textbook is used for gifted & talented students and/or pre-advanced placement/honors students and/or regular on-grade-level-in-reading students

and/or regular below-grade-level-in reading students/”struggling readers” and/or English language learning (ELLs) students.

I collected data from the textbooks in the using grounded theory with reference to the guiding questions. Guided theory according to Strauss and Corbin (1990) insists on identifying themes. Sylvia Wynter (2006, 2003, 2000, 1995, 1992[1990], 1970) developed a method – the Wynterian Approach or SWA insists on taking notes on the text being read and analyzed is how to create a code to be analyzed later for themes. The Wynterian Approach should allow for the creation of “theory notes” that summarize key ideas in the text. The other item that the Wynterian Approach is very good for is curing the sin of essentialism in that it encourages the researcher to find negative examples that disconfirm the themes he/she has hypothesized he/she will find which then force a shift in the original hypothesis (Strauss and Corbin, 1990).

I made an appointment with the Texas Education Agency Instructional Materials division, because the Texas State Textbook Archive is there. I explained my interest in the archive and developed a relationship with a social studies curriculum specialist in this division, because this specialist explained to me how the archive is set up and showed me how to navigate it. The TEA curriculum specialist helped me find the appropriate materials. I wrote down the instructions that the TEA social studies curriculum specialist gave me about using the Texas State Textbook Archive. After the tutorial, I opened each instructional material to peruse the information within and at the 7th grade level use the

indexes of the textbooks to count the number of times the names Stephen F. Austin appears in the textbooks. I recorded the page numbers and the number of times each of these two names appears in each textbook. I noted any special features in which any of the three topics appear in the textbook by examining the table of contents. I do this because I examined each page on which these topics appear to determine whether Stephen F. Austin is presented as a topic of varying complexity and could potentially show opposing presentations of Stephen F. Austin. To deepen the examination, as suggested by Kearney from grounded theory, about this topic, Stephen F. Austin, in the instructional materials with these cross-referenced questions: 1) How do these chosen topics interact with Black people of their time? 2) Are there any explicit mentions of how these topics interact with Black people? 3) Is there any evidence in how these topics are presented that explicitly challenges students to engage in rigorous historical thinking in order to develop the mental habit of historical consciousness? Grounded theory as analyzed by Kearney (1995) emphasizes that grounded theory allows for the presentation of a model with supporting textual evidence.

How does the scholar gather data from each of the public memory sites?

I examined three sites public memory – 1) The Bob Bullock Texas State History Museum, 2) The Texas State Cemetery, 3) The Texas State Capitol to determine how the topic of Stephen F. Austin is presented to Texas history students. I used the theory of participant observation to evaluate the topic of Stephen F. Austin. Participant observation

is a way to collect data in relatively unstructured manner (Spradley, 1980). According to Holy (1984) participant observation allows for learning from observation while the researcher is actively engaged and achieving understanding. The guiding questions:

For the single historical figure - Stephen F. Austin - I asked the following guiding questions about his presentation:

- 1) How is Stephen F. Austin men presented in the state-adopted instructional materials?
- 2) How is Stephen F. Austin's life used as symbols? Are the symbols benign? Are the symbols iconographic? Does Stephen F. Austin's life get transformed into an iconic site of public memory? Is he represented as raced or racialized figures?[This means: White, male, patriot, frontiersman, warrior, bravery, courage, intelligence, freedom-fighter.]
- 3) How is Stephen F. Austin's life positioned in relation to/in comparison to enslaved Blacks (people of African descent)? free Blacks? White Anglo-American settlers? In relation to/in comparison to Mexico, Mexico's government and government officials, Native Americans?
- 4) Is Stephen F. Austin presented as an ordinary "human" as defined in his lifetime and this time in which we live now or as an extraordinary trailblazer ahead of his time?
- 5) In each public memory site what references does Stephen F. Austin receive?

Another aspect of participant observation that I used to collect data at the two public

memory sites on the topics is “narrative ethnography.” According to Tedlock (1991), this method permits the demystification of the role of the process of writing and ethnography because a standard monograph is written of the topic being studied while the voice of the ethnographer is allowed to make itself known. Tedlock’s approach allows that subjectivity is part of social studies research. Another important point that buttresses the subjectivity argument about participant observation is that the field notes that the researcher makes are simultaneously data and analysis. This means that during this process the researcher could create a Geertz’s (1975) thick description, which is an interpretive ethnography that could be a synthesis. Sylvia Wynter’s Approach (2009, 2003, 2001, 1995, 1990, 1970) developed a method insists on taking notes on the text, the public memory site, being read and analyzed is how to create a code to be analyzed later for themes. The Wynterian Approach should allow for the creation of “theory notes” that summarize and unearth ideas that could be hidden in the public memory – “alternative cultural models”- which stand alongside along with readily noted dominant cultural ideas – “native cultural models.” The other item that the Wynterian Approach is very good for is exposing the incompleteness of essential narratives in that it encourages the researcher to excavate for examples that disconfirm the themes he/she has hypothesized he/she will find which then force a shift in the original hypothesis.

To gather data, I drove to The Bob Bullock Texas State History Museum and parked my truck in the handicapped space underneath the building. I walked into the

Museum and purchased a ticket. I asked for a guidebook of the museum so that I could pinpoint information on Stephen F. Austin upon which to make notes as a participant observer. I noted the exhibits and their locations. After this I began my exploration of the specific exhibits to make field notes that I needed to see first and later would make another walk to make field notes about the interconnectedness of the exhibits. I made a third exploration through the museum using the guiding questions.

The second public memory site I explored to collect data as a participant observer would be the Texas State Cemetery. I called to make an appointment to visit this public memory site. I entered the reception office and ask for a guide. My goal here is be to determine how this public memory site presents the topic of Stephen F. Austin. I walked and studied the grounds three times so that I could make thick description field notes that allow me to interpret the meaning of the topics.

How does the scholar code the data from the field notes?

To code the data that has been collected from the field notes at the Bob Bullock Texas State History Museum and the Texas State Cemetery collected while a participant observer. I employed a combination of the Wynterian Approach and content analysis. Jean and Doucet (1996) suggest that this combination allows for using word counts to identify themes and codes. Words that appear more often could be used to create themes.

Later I used content analysis that required a re-reading of the original field notes to determine whether there was an overlap in common themes. Common themes across the two public memory sites as well as between the instructional materials and public memory sites emerge. Divergent themes could emerge as well forcing a rigorous re-reading of the exhibits dealing with Stephen F. Austin in both public memory sites.

How does the scholar develop themes that reflect a finding across the texts?

I used symbolic analysis to develop themes across texts – the instructional materials and public memory sites – with respect to one topic – Stephen F. Austin with respect to the representations of this topic along with respect to specific cross-referential themes of Blacks. The Wynterian Approach mixed with content analysis proposed earlier as a way to yield data potentially is hypothesized to allow for the identification of themes across these two topics; however, while Jean and Doucet’s work could prove effective another mode of analysis of the data from the field notes could prove still more helpful. Symbolic analysis of Furbee (1996) encourages a deeper familiarity with the symbols deployed in exhibits and textbooks, because another reading of the texts could open the possibility of the discovery of more stories. Matthews (1992) and Hutchins (1980) suggest that the re-reading could even yield a new grammar that forces the participant observer to acknowledge what people really do. For a study of two topics from Texas History a shared underlying logic could possibly be exposed. This is the potential of symbolic analysis to yield yet more themes of greater explanatory gravitas. The Wynterian

Approach does insist that the question: What does it mean to be human? be used to open analysis of the hidden meanings often obscured and/or ignored by the normative application of the dominance discourse versions of the topic of analysis.

How does the scholar use the Wynterian Approach for Data?

I used of the Wynterian Approach (2006, 2003, 2000, 1995, 1992[1990]) to analyze the relationships in and among the topics of Stephen F. Austin and Sam Houston. The Wynterian Approach hinges on the “sociogenic principle” that contains the concepts of “Black Studies Perspective,” subjective understanding” and “alternative cultural model.” By using Wynter’s method a new more rigorous social studies narrative could become possible. This possibility stems from the fact that the Wynterian Approach is not just interdisciplinary but transdisciplinary. Wynter insists that the master narrative must be articulated alongside alternative narratives that could be derived directly from the master narrative yet shows the failures of the master narrative to offer full disclosure of the historical event. What happens when the master narratives of Stephen F. Austin and along with the TEKS that enable them are shown to be lacking in integrity? How could the Wynterian Approach encourage a movement toward a re-writing of the curriculum to transform it into a motivating force for a consistently increasingly diverse student body in public education with fresh findings instead of a de-motivating force of miseducation and alienation? What is the purpose of social studies in the 21st Century? For Stephen F.

Austin the Wynterian Approach is applied to show how theory can allow a more rigorous and inclusive portrayal of famous historical people and events to emerge.

The master narrative/dominance discourse/native cultural model in the instructional materials concerning Stephen F. Austin portrays him as a man removed from his time in that he stands above history. This habit of portraying Austin as almost a sainted leader who selflessly sacrificed himself for Texas is called hagiography. It so happens that such a portrayal of anyone in this way is considered a work of fiction. The fictional Austin is always responsible, always manly, always shrewd, always has the pulse of the people. When applying Wynter's theoretical concepts to understanding Austin what does one find?

Through the lens of subjective understanding one could examine Austin's views as enmeshed within other mainstream narrative histories of Texas. One might find that Austin was, indeed, a man of his time. He viewed himself as a savior of his Anglo-American settlers and of White privileges. Austin saw no problems with owning Blacks as slaves and brutally exploiting them. He defended his colony and Texas as part of Mexico against having emancipation of slaves imposed by the government of Mexico even though slavery was illegal in the rest of Mexico. Austin argued that slavery was necessary to develop the labor intensive cotton industry in Texas because Whites would never work for low wages when they had the opportunity to but cheap land in abundance. Austin used his position as a well-respected empresario to lobby the central government

of Mexico and the state government of *Coahuila y Tejas* to exempt Texas from the abolition of slavery. Austin was so intent on getting around any regulations and laws that could possibly inhibit the possession of human property that he wrote a proposal for a law that respected all foreign labor contracts in the state of *Coahuila y Tejas*. This law nullified the *Coahuila y Tejas State Constitution of 1827's* provision that stated “no one shall be born a slave in this state.” The devious action that Austin backed by his White settler supporters and Tejano supporters undertook was to have all Black slaves “sign” contracts as lifetime indentured servants. In the contract the Black slave asserted that he/she understood that for his/her fulfillment of the contract that he/she must work for a wage to pay their employer (master) the cost of purchasing them plus the cost of their upkeep (food clothing tools) while they were taught the art of farming and the art of cooking (Campbell, 2003). This episode illustrates how Stephen F. Austin viewed himself and what thoughts shaped his decisions. This information is not provided in any of the textbooks nor alluded to in the TEKS. Does this analysis using the lens of “subjective understanding” offer a more truthful and more human view of Stephen F. Austin as an imperfect and, yes, racist, man who supported the degradation of his fellow human beings if it meant profit and power for himself? Moreover, note how “subjective understanding” establishes a link to theorizing what both the Wynterian concepts of “normative cultural model” – dominant narrative - and “alternative cultural model” – marginalized/silenced narrative - of the historical time in which Austin lived. To go further, an opening now comes to allow for projects of transformation to be done by

students by asking them to reconstruct the thoughts of a Black slave being asked to sign a contract to remain enslaved. These are the opportunities for enhancing social studies education that exist with Wynter as her concepts engage the development of multi-vocal historical consciousness and historical thinking.

In examining the sites of public memory, the Texas State Cemetery and the Bob Bullock Texas State History Museum, both sites need to have the question asked concerning their original intents. This means asking: What were the founding principles of both of these public memory sites? By applying the “sociogenic principle” to this question of founding intent, one could ask who was invited to sit on the boards that developed these sites. After that one could examine the political and economic and social interests of these founders. Then the question of exclusion comes to the fore and a full explanation must be researched rather than reliance on a dismissive reason. Through this question of exclusion, the subjective understandings as well as alternative cultural models never considered for use in the development of these public memory sites could become more evident. Here is where historical thinking and historical consciousness can be developed for the public-at-large and Texas students in particular. The goal is to transform behavior so that these public memory sites can become more revered and viewed as truly representative of all Texans - a racially, ethnically, culturally and ethically diverse group.

How does the scholar report the findings?

I reported the findings in the following venues. According to Kottak (1998) findings could be published in trade books, textbooks, professional (academic) books, refereed journals, and popular articles. Another avenue could be in curriculum. There is no one way to report findings. The findings could end up in a dissertation. The point is that the arguments are well-articulated and findings well-supported by ample evidence.

METHOD

How does Wynter use the Wynterian Approach?

Sylvia Wynter creates a method by which the scholar could articulate usually ignored and intentionally marginalized narratives/discourses of the people constructed in the dominant discourses as subhuman. Wynter does this by reading the dominant discourse of a particular historical time and/or event and/or person that is valued by the dominant group but she turns the discourse inside out by articulating from within the dominant discourse a newly discovered discourse of the intentionally marginalized groups. The dominant discourse presents these marginalized people as “nullius” or non-existent (Newcomb, 2008). Because these groups are non-existent they must lack human abilities to learn, be self-motivated, to appreciate life, to use technology, to accumulate wealth and to build lasting institutions – the qualities of civilization. Wynter asserts that these people do have the qualities of civilization but were never afforded a fair and reasonable opportunity to articulate their qualities of civilization. Their material culture

was negated as was their oral culture, because the practitioners of the dominant discourse actively set about destroying these non-dominant challenges to their dominant worldview.

Wynter exposes the fact that colonialism created an interlocking system of negations of culture for the dominated people. Within institutions, such as education, created with the stated intention of improving the lives of the historically marginalized groups, the curriculum was established that intentionally miseducated the historically marginalized children and their parents and all members of the colonizing/dominant social groups. School curriculum reflected in school textbooks will present narratives that are by degree unrelated to the realities of the students' cultural lives and family histories (Shohat & Stam, 2002). This intentional miseducation devalorizes the lives of the dominated students. If this intentional harming of dominated students occurs is it reasonable to assume that marginalized people are similarly degraded in their everyday lives at work, or in the grocery store, or in popular entertainments?

How does the scholar use the Wynterian Approach in Method?

I used the Wynterian Approach to answer two interrelated questions that drive her scholarship. The answers that the scholar provides, as a proposition, based in a detailed study and analysis of Sylvia Wynter's scholarship to these questions will permit the assemblage of a potential framework that explains how her method operates. The method,

called the Wynterian Approach, will be detailed in four related principles that demonstrate in detail what Wynter does.

Driving question one: How could Wynter's scholarship/work provide new analytical tools or the social studies curriculum? Driving question two: How does Wynter's scholarship/work create a new conceptual space for the dilemmas of inclusion and exclusion in the social studies curriculum? These questions will be answered simultaneously. Finally, an explanation will be provided of how the scholar will apply the Wynterian Approach to his research. These examples below will suggest questions that could be asked in the classroom to stimulate thinking about historical consciousness and historical thinking within the Wynterian Approach. This will in turn lead to a suggestion by the scholar of how the Wynterian Approach enhances the social studies curriculum through historical consciousness and historical thinking in the Texas State Social Studies Curriculum for Texas History at the 4th and 7th grade levels in the specific instances of the social studies figures, Stephen F. Austin and Sam Houston.

Wynter identifies long established narratives and the dominant discourses attached to those narratives. She recognizes the validity of these narratives as part of an already existing canon that over time mostly has become ossified and handed down as the best research of its historical cultural moment and so, became accepted as the dominant controlling knowledge that is somehow foundational to the ongoing culture-project known as the universal and obviously logical true culture of Western European

Civilization. The problem is that upon a deep reading this “universal true culture” is shown to be particular and local vision of the world. Texas and the United States of America were formed by this true culture, the normative cultural model called Western European Civilization that embraced all people who were designated as White as logical human beings while marking those designated as lacking whiteness – Black, Reds, Yellows, Browns – all non-Whites as born inferior and subhuman. More importantly, Wynter shows respect for these Western European Civilization research of scholars from the past by taking the time to thoroughly analyze their works in their languages of Spanish, Portuguese, French, English plus tracing their scholarship, as they believed the only true scholarship, through the culturally constructed disciplines of theology, law, philosophy, history, geography, economics, sociology, literature and anthropology – the full array of disciplines that would make up the interdisciplinary subject of social studies. In showing this intellectual respect for these scholars Wynter demonstrates through her actions her choice to respect their human-ness and intellectual integrity, which was rare based on the cultural knowledges that were available to them. These same scholars chose not to, in general save except on rare occasion, extend this same respect to the cultural knowledges of Black, Red, Yellow, Brown, non-White, non-male, non-European scholars. Wynter takes all scholarship that impacts on the construction of a viable mutually reinforcing human dignity for all humans in the world at any historical moment as a serious project and recognizes that her actions as a human in the field of social studies that studies human cultures must enact her deliberately well-researched scholarly

conclusions that all humans do deserve to live with their human dignity protected and their bodies safe from psychological and physical harm and abuse.

Here is an example of Wynter taking past designated-by-Western-Europeans as the best universal scholarship with seriousness. She acknowledges how Columbus' mentalite concerning the importance of spreading the True Faith, Catholicism, to counter the innate evil of non-Christians was formed before he sailed mistakenly to Asia and landed in the Caribbean. Because Columbus was pre-disposed to thinking in this way, Wynter is able to further explain how Columbus could in his journals refer to the indigenous peoples he encountered as "making good slaves" because they were non-Christians, which in turn, legitimated his expropriating their territory for Castile and Aragon (Pagden, 1982; Pandian, 1985). The dominant narrative established for Columbus from his having lived and worked in what are now Italy, Portugal and Spain meant that he was exposed to ideas associated with the Reconquista, an 800 year – 711 to 1492 - religious war on the Iberian Peninsula deemed a Holy Crusade by the Pope to free Christendom from the specter of Islam. As Mills (1997) asserts dominance over the designated "Other" was asserted through violence as a normative behavior. Columbus did undertake a great adventure while at the same time being burdened with a normative way of thinking that could potentially be problematic. Wynter wants the reader of her scholarship to understand the full intellectual background that underpins ideas because origins matter and, also it leads to the next point. Also she questions why such anti-

human scholarship was not more vigorously challenged and refuted. By taking this scholarship seriously Wynter is able to identify potential gaps in that scholarship as it pertains to non-European cultural models of knowledge.

Chapter 4

“[Teaching American literature] has become the teaching of an aesthetic and political order in which no person of color, no woman, was ever able to discover the reflection or representation of his or her cultural image or voice.” – Henry Louis Gates, Jr.

INTRODUCTION

Common Narratives of Stephen F. Austin

The purpose of chapter 4 is to display the general tendencies of the official state of Texas social studies curriculum at the fourth (4th) grade and seventh (7th) grade levels, as approved by the democratically elected Texas State Board of Education (SBOE) and supervised by the Texas Education Agency, the administrative and enforcement branch of the SBOE, as manifested in the officially state of Texas adopted instructional materials purchased from for-profit educational publishing firms. In addition, this chapter will examine the dominant discourse at work in the Texas social studies curricula and explain the findings that emerge from a close reading of the fourth (4th) grade and seventh (7th) grade instructional materials. When themes emerge are they related one must ask what does the dominant discourse trend toward and what circumstances permit the dominant discourse to be slanted in a given direction that helps some students while harming others? To illustrate how the dominant discourse deploys its semiotic in terms of developing certain distinct iconographic representations, this chapter will examine

dominant discourse as common sense. “Common sense,” in the case of the Wynterian Approach is a concept that suffuses this chapter, and is an interlocking interdisciplinary concept that merges Michael Apple’s (2011) “common sense’ as a harmful political narrative that hinders the development of a true understanding of historical events with Carter G. Woodson’s (1933) “mis-education theory” that states the intentional misrepresentation and erasing of certain historical facts amounts to the intention to do harm to the development of a healthy mental and cognitive state in terms of accepting one’s self as a fully capable human being. Michel Foucault (1972) refers to the use of language as a technology of power that is deployed to create a certain general way of thinking about a particular targeted object, which is another way of talking about developing “common sense” to meet a desired power outcome. These three concepts of “common sense” are then merged with Fanon’s (1952) concept of “sociogeny” which states that a human beings self-worth is the psychological outcome of experienced social forces in the form of statements used to define that person from trusted educational institutions, one’s family, and statements deployed in public by strangers that lock one into a seemingly fixed position that is contradictory to how one had come to perceive one’s self. This idea of “common sense” will be applied in analyzing the texts, instructional materials, that are specifically geared toward the fourth (4th) and seventh (7th) grade Texas social studies TEKS, which are addressed. In addition, sites of public memory, which are not addressed in the TEKS will be analyzed.

Wynter (2000; 1992/1990; 1970; 1968) explains this to us with her intentional embracing of interdisciplinarity. Interdisciplinarity refers specifically to her use of what Rugg (1952), the founder of the (inter)discipline of Social Studies, identifies as, with multicultural curriculum scholar James Banks (1981) concurring, are the component subjects/disciplines of Social Studies - Anthropology, Economics, Geography, History, Psychology, Political Science, and Sociology. Taken together a true Social Studies curriculum ought not to exclude any human anywhere at any time in any place. Interdisciplinarity which is multi-perspectival, refers to Wynter's consistent embrace of the human, which in this case is the full range of ways of knowing created through the efforts of humans in the forms these humans have chosen. What this means is that Wynter engages in what Deleuze and Guattari (2003[1987]) refer to as "rhizomic thinking" by creating "rhizomic networks." Wynter (2006; 2003; 1996; 1995; 1994; 1992/1990; 1970; 1968) incorporates the work of undocumented folkways and dances, computer scientists, juridical texts, religious writings and semiotic philosophers into her work in an attempt to develop narratives that give voice to the full range of humans, especially those who have historically been marginalized, peripheralized and erased.

Given the aforementioned, an examination of a single important state of Texas historical figure will be undertaken. This figure will be Stephen Fuller Austin – Stephen F. Austin – 1793-1836. He will be examined in terms of his standard or common appearance in the state-adopted instructional materials at the fourth (4th) grade and

seventh (7th) grade levels. The instructional materials have been read to determine the different ways – instantiations - in which Stephen F. Austin is presented. Examples of each of these instantiations will be provided due to a close reading of the texts. Texts in these cases are anything that can be read and analyzed and compared to another text from which meaning emerges.

The texts that have been examined are the state-adopted instructional materials at the fourth (4th) grade and seventh (7th) grade levels. These instructional materials are textbooks at the seventh (7th) grade level and a weekly magazine reader, *Texas Studies Weekly* (2015) at the fourth (4th) grade level. The publishers of the 7th grade textbooks are *Texas History* (2015) published Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, *Texas History* (2015) published by McGraw Hill Education, and *Texas History* (2015) published by Pearson Education. Austin Independent School District (AISD) for which this scholar works as a seventh (7th) grade social studies teacher of Texas History and Geography chose the McGraw Hill book because it had the best maps and on-line ancillaries. I, also, was one of the two teachers who served on the AISD seventh (7th) grade social studies instructional materials evaluation committee who recommended this textbook be purchased by AISD for use, and it was. The publisher of the fourth (4th) grade instructional material, *Texas Studies Weekly*, is American Legacy Publishing, Inc. based in Utah. This reader is done in newspaper/magazine form and contains many short

articles that follow the weekly scope and sequence of the official state fourth (4th) grade Texas social studies curriculum.

The final set of texts that have been read emerges from educational trips to sites of public memory. These sites of public memory are being added by the scholar because nowhere in the TEKS for the fourth (4th) grade and seventh (7th) grade are these sites of public memory mentioned. The sites of public memory used as texts in this paper to examine the different representations of Stephen F. Austin in sites of public memory are the Bob Bullock Texas State History Museum, the Texas State Cemetery, and The Texas State Capitol. The usefulness of these sites of public memory emerges from the fact of how they are seemingly over-mediated and over-read yet are contested as iconographic cultural sites that drive to heart of what it means to be a Texan when compared to the ways in which instructional materials are heavily used, talked about, and have an official state-adopted curriculum to assist the consumers, teachers, pupils and students, and the public-at-large in “understanding” in this case, Stephen F. Austin, in a particular manner that falls within the acceptable boundaries of the dominant discourse.

This chapter addresses the official state social studies curriculum, the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS), at the 4th and 7th grade levels deals with the social studies as pertains to Texas. One must remember that social studies from its development by Harold O. Rugg always has been an interdisciplinary field of study. The social studies TEKS for Texas, therefore, correctly contains curriculum encompassing

both directly and indirectly the fields of anthropology, economics, geography, history, political science, psychology and sociology. Very importantly, the Texas social studies TEKS remember that developing an active citizenship in pupils and students is necessary to assist them in developing an appreciation for the unique gift of living in a democratic republic and, moreover, the fact that this democratic republic encourages people from every sex, race, physical ability, language, and location to take an active role. One will find that the “common sense” will be addressed as the term applies to the the situating and situatedness of Stephen F. Austin in the 4th and 7th grade TEKS. Also, Stephen F. Austin will be examined as a state of Texas icon as pertains to how he appears in the general landscapes of Texas at taxpayer supported public institutions, such as public schools, universities, and state parks. Finally, Stephen F. Austin will examined through how he is placed in sites of public memory, such as museums, cemeteries, and state offices.

Theorizing Common Sense

It is my belief that the best way to empower my fellow humans is to wake each one of them up to their humanity and their worth and to the hidden stuff that tends to taint existence. This is the purpose of attacking and excavating “common sense” and associated ideas of truth. Derrida (1981) states that anything claiming to be an archive ought to be a subject of laughter and suspicion. Foucault (1972) asserts an archeology of knowledge exists. The archeology is constructed of power that comes from the use of

words deployed in particular aggregations at a target to assert control over first a mental image and after that the concrete control of associated thoughts and actions. Woodson (1933) asserted that “common sense” was usually in the wrong minds and hands and so what be a helpful developmental series of interlocking ideas instead becomes tools of social death. He called this abuse of “common sense” mis-education and dedicated his life to developing an effective counter-common sense wherein each human in the wrongly targeted communities as well as those who were not target could come to sit down and learn a little to do a lot of good. Fanon (1952) concurs with Woodson by arguing through psychoanalytical research that there are entire people and places that have been abused to the point of engaging in unreflective self-hatred because of generations being exposed to the “common sense” of the most powerful people in the society. Joyce E. King (1991) suggests that the problem that “common sense” represents is that because of the fact of its presentation in many forms across disciplines and in social studies in particular those who consume the information therein come to suffer from “dysconscious racism.” This means the students, teachers, and the public-at-large tend to uncritically accept human behavior from the past that they would or might find abhorrent. Taken together the work of these scholars demonstrate that truth, especially in school curriculum, must always be subject to public scrutiny and analytical research in the universities and the public schools.

Common sense narrative sites can be seen at Stephen F. Austin High School in Austin Independent School District, Stephen F. Austin State University in Nacogdoches, Texas, Stephen F. Austin State Park in San Felipe, Texas and at the Stephen F. Austin Statue and Visitors Center in Angleton, Texas, there is a seventy feet (70 ft.) tall statue of Stephen F. Austin that has “Father of Texas” carved into the base and is situated on lake that is carved in the shape of Texas (www.visitbrazosport.com). The usefulness of these common sense narrative sites is that they simply rely on the use of the name of Stephen F. Austin as evidence-in-itself of pre-determined greatness. What emerges from these common sense narrative sites is the fact of how they are seemingly under-mediated, under-read and yet overdetermined as iconographic when compared to the ways in which instructional materials are heavily used, talked about, and have an official state-adopted curriculum to assist the consumers, teachers, pupils and students, and the public-at-large in “understanding” in this case, Stephen F. Austin, in a particular manner that falls within the acceptable boundaries of the dominant discourse. The over-determination of the iconography of Stephen F. Austin in these common sense narrative sites emerges from the sense of everyday use of site as in Stephen F. Austin High School (Wynter 2005; Fanon 1952). When everyday use is combined with distance - with the examples of Stephen F. Austin State University, Stephen F. Austin State Park, and the Stephen F. Austin Statue and Visitor’s Center at Henry William Munson Park – situated away from a major city, a metropole or core urban agglomeration – a normally message-contested rich spaces - which are thought of as major arbiters of simultaneous cultural maintenance and

cultural contestation in Texas these symbols increase in strength of singularity of message. Common sense narrative sites could be thought of as those that usually simply exist under the radar everyday radiating the dominant discourse in a steady uncontested manner in a mono-cultural environment (Wallerstein, 1996).

Stephen F. Austin exists as a relational item. Stephen F. Austin exists in the Texas State Social Studies Curriculum (TEKS) at the fourth (4th) grade and seventh (7th) grade level as “significant individual” whose contributions must be learned. In the official Austin Independent School District instructional materials for Texas Social Studies adoptions at the fourth (4th) grade and seventh (7th) grade levels Stephen F. Austin can be described by three interlocking themes: 1) The Father of Texas; 2) The Empresario; 3) The Liberal, Populist and Statesman. Given these representations of Stephen F. Austin one must ask why and how these dominant images came to dominate and in Texas education at the fourth (4th) and seventh (7th)grade levels? Also, one must ask what images are excluded. Examples from the instructional materials and the sites of public memory will be used to make the case for each of these interlocking dominant discourse dependent representations.

The historical figure, Stephen F. Austin, has been chosen as an object of scrutiny within the Texas Social Studies curriculum at the 4th and 7th grade levels. This chapter shall speak to the common sense ways of seeing Stephen F. Austin in a series of texts – public institutions and public arenas – available to the public taxpayer and residents in

Texas state-adopted textbooks at the fourth (4th) and seventh (7th) grade levels; in the Texas state-adopted official curriculum for Texas social studies at the fourth (4th) grade and seventh (7th) grade levels; in sites of public memory – The Bob Bullock Texas State History Museum and The Texas State Cemetery and The Texas State Capitol as well as Stephen F. Austin State University, Stephen F. Austin High School in Austin Independent School District, Stephen F. Austin Texas State Park in San Felipe, Texas and Stephen F. Austin Statue and Visitor’s Center at Henry William Munson Park in Angleton, Texas. This chapter will challenge the common sense ways of digesting Stephen F. Austin.

Here is a simple direct observation concerning Texas Social Studies and why it is taught. The title of this section contains the word “contingent” and that word is pregnant with implications of uncertainty and so will be excavated following the simple statement. The problem with uncertainty is that when paired with a state-mandated curriculum it asserts that the process of curriculum-making and adoption are pulling in opposite directions. So contingency and uncertainty challenge a “pristine” curriculum as put forward in “curricular deliberations that were controversial and deeply informed by ideology” (Vasquez Heilig, Brown and Brown, 2012). What this means is that there is a huge space that opens in which to consider a host of ideas to challenge the supposed solid truth-full Texas social studies curricula at the 4th and 7th grade level. Given the contingency of truth these topics could be examined profitably to both support the current

dominant ideas of truth-in-curriculum with new ideas and to offer counter-narratives to the current dominant ideas of truth-in-curricula. Three intersubjective social, economic, political and geographic questions: 1) What did Whites and Blacks each believe about themselves in their relations with Whites and Blacks in a democratic constitutional republic? 2) What position will Blacks hold in this American society given that the minority of Blacks are free while 95% of Blacks are enslaved? 3) How did Stephen F. Austin interact with White and Black contemporaries? Associated with these questions are these topics that are guaranteed to open new ways of comprehending, understanding, analyzing, applying, and synthesizing the curricula interdisciplinary topics of race, whiteness, safe space, positionality, and, especially rejecting cruelty by engaging active and/or passive positive support for human dignity and human rights (e.g. abolition movement with its many manifestations).

Here is the simple straightforward statement: Texas History is important because the state of Texas through the Texas Legislature supervised by the Texas Education Agency (TEA) mandates that the course must be taught to students at both the 4th grade and the 7th grade. Texas social studies, whose most emphasized portions are the History strand and the Geography strand is meant to transmit values that the Texas State Board of Education (SBOE), a publically elected and, therefore, political and ideological policymaking entity. It is the most representative as the Texas State Board of Education only has fifteen (15) elected officials for the entire state that make public education

policy. This is the real political context in Texas education policy, a culture-transmitting guide, is constructed by very fallible humans, the fifteen elected members of the State Board of Education. If the official state-approved Texas social studies curricula (TEKS) at 4th grade and 7th grade levels have, in fact, become state-mandated common sense narratives then a dangerous anti-human, anti-human rights, anti-critical thinking and anti-21st century skills development situation arises wherein Texas students will be placed in a skills deficit as compared to their compatriots within the United States and worldwide. This is important because it within this convergence of contingent factors that teachers must teach and students must learn based upon a document that appears to be thwart education.

Given this Texas education policy that includes curriculum and hiring standards for teachers is subject to a common sense approach, which is too often misleading. Section 1119 of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) focuses on improving teacher quality at the local level. To achieve this goal, the act requires all teachers teaching core subject academic areas to meet specific competency and educational requirements. Teachers who meet these requirements are considered “Highly Qualified.” This stamp of approval means that the person who is hired must be as follows: Teachers are required to be highly qualified if they are the Teacher of Record providing direct instruction to students in any core academic subject area, including English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages (languages other than English), civics and government,

economics, arts, history, and geography. Highly qualified teachers must: hold at least a bachelor's degree; be fully certified to teach in Texas; and demonstrate competency in their core academic subject area (tea.texas.gov). This statement of what the elected Texas State Board of Education through the advice of the Texas Education Agency adopted from US Department of Education guidelines demonstrates their certainty. The lack of any comprehensive list of expectations what a future teacher might wish to know suggests an assembly line one size fits all approach to hiring teachers. More disturbingly this lack of information suggests a lack of coordination between teacher preparation programs in accredited universities and accredited regional education service center programs along with school districts. Certainly there appears to be no statewide look into the future that would attach teaching skills and subject knowledge to the much touted 21st Century skills and college readiness that is being rhetorically mentioned at the seventh (7th) grade level and as early as fourth (4th) grade. These 21st century skills are broadly speaking: 1) Learning and Innovation Skills – critical thinking, problem-solving, collaboration; 2) Digital Literacy – how to find and use information, how to evaluate information; 3) Career and Life Skills – self-direction, self-control, accountability, flexibility, responsibility, cross-cultural skills (Trilling & Fadel, 2009). This is a problem of contingency that throws the very idea of truth into crisis as it appears that no one knows precisely what is desired in a teacher. Rugg, the founder of the social studies discipline, suggested this as a problem some sixty years ago when he observed that local habits generally determine what is desired in a social studies teacher. Rugg viewed this a

huge problem because it meant to him that teachers were frequently from the communities in which they taught and so were less inclined to engage in creative approaches to teaching that the community might find disturbing. This is a problem of stasis, which in social studies, as Rugg saw it, does nothing to develop the mental habits of evaluation, analysis and criticality of everyday human actions that create healthy involved patriotic citizens (Rugg, 1952).

Yet we are still left with the problems of contingency and uncertainty in curriculum and teacher hiring specifically as concerns Texas social studies. Contingency is a problem that deals with the truth or reliability of a matter. Curriculum in social studies is supposed to be set of reliable instructions rooted in factually accurate, “truthful”, information that guides teacher decisionmaking to provide opportunities for each to student to engage in intellectual development and skills development necessary for taking advantage of opportunities to build a life as a participatory critical citizen in a republican democracy (Parker, 2003; Rorty, 1988; Trilling & Fadel, 2009). Scholars such as Brown and Brown (2011) have found that curriculum reflects the chief concerns of the most powerful organized and well-funded interest groups at the local, state and national levels. This is what Mills (1997) would term a dominance discourse in a racial contract because the idea of a democratically elected body, the SBOE, being subjugated to given political interests in the designing of state social studies curricula for every Texas student to receive a “free and appropriate public education” would constitute bad

faith, which is not an ideal state for entering into agreements. With all of the above ideas about curriculum design discussed contingency exists within all of them. Contingency exists in the world and influences truth-making because to explain contingency means that we must be willing to admit that belief and truth are rooted in the chosen vocabulary to describe a given particular instance of human action or human observation (Rorty, 1988). If social studies curriculum is a reflection of the social studies beliefs of the majority of the members of the Texas SBOE then one must remember that belief overwhelms truth and so belief then matters above any researched document whether of conservative ideology or liberal ideology. Teacher hiring becomes more contingent because if local schools are a mirror of the state education institutions that shape the acceptable data to be learned then teachers could be asked non-reflective ideological questions that only require a knee-jerk ideological response.

Carter G. Woodson (1933) identified the common sense approach to making education policy as “miseducation.” By this term he meant that what is put into a curriculum can be placed there intentionally to shape a certain outlook toward certain groups of people toward themselves and toward others. Woodson was referring to the curricula he had evaluated throughout the United States to examine how the Black American citizen in particular and people of African descent in general were constructed. Lamentably he found that the intention of the carefully constructed curricula was to imbue people of African descent, Black peoples, with a sense of self-hatred and

hopelessness at ever becoming anyone significant. Those same curricula were designed to show White American citizens, people of European descent that all Whites were naturally born to be leaders of all Black people anyplace, anytime, anywhere. The positionality of being black or white determines to some extent how one would tend to filter curricular information about Stephen F. Austin. Two scholars, who buttress Woodson and Wynter, are Patricia Collins (1991) in *Black Feminist Thought* and Emmanuel Eze (1998) in *African Philosophy*. Within the 4th grade and the 7th grade TEKS, Eze's assertions could be used by an informed teacher under the "Social Studies Skills" and "Citizenship" skills which requires students to compare and contract information as well as to make decisions that generate outcomes that must be defended. Wynter (1997) commenting on Woodson (1933) would assert that the intention of this mis-education was to remove the possibility of allowing a systemic challenge to the truth of the present order. How? Those who developed the curriculum as an exclusionary dominant discourse take the idea that what they are developing represents an "objective truth" even though their stated objectivity is the result of a "systemic repression of all other perspectives, especially those of all non-White population groups."

Collins (1991) speaks to positionality as a standpoint from which one understands the world. It is important that one's standpoint receive sufficient encouragement for one to develop it in all of its potential directions – a safe space. The purpose of the safe space is to allow each person to receive encouragement to do the research she/he desires in

order to delve more deeply into her/his particular desire, standpoint, to formulate the construct of her/his nascent worldview. The intention is not to create perfection but rather to develop a human dignity filled safe space of mutual respect in which to commit one's self to finding answers and then sharing those answers. This safe space becomes a human rights rich human community in which all who join hold a stake. The purpose of safe space is to alienate distortions of vision. What then are the sources of these distortions? Well, within Texas social studies curriculum an example of distortion of vision begins with the fact that there are no questions that explicitly link Austin's beliefs about race and position to every action he took in establishing his colony and making the laws down to the slave code he developed for his colony. There are no questions that promote a belief in humanization and helping people to develop into committed human beings. There are no statements that acknowledge that a center has developed that intends to push as many people to the margins as possible. Within the 4th grade and the 7th grade TEKS, Collins' assertions could be used by an informed teacher under the "Social Studies Skills" and "Citizenship" skills which requires students to compare and contract information as well as to make decisions that generate outcomes that must be defended. Wynter (1997) would comment that Collins is re-stating her idea of the need for an alternative cultural model (ACM) to stand alongside the already established truncated local history known as "common sense official TEKS" or native cultural model (NCM). Wynter views Collins' standpoint as a challenge to "absolutized notion of order that creates a space of otherness" that is necessarily unstable because from the perspective of the NCM any

challenge could not have emerged from their established canon of acceptable knowledge. Wynter (2006) further states this position of otherness forced upon the marginalized – Blacks and Indians – is meant to demonstrate through their lack of material goods and inability to attain cultural capital a state of constant, persistent and permanent lack. Simply put Blacks and Indians lack whiteness and so according to the worldview of the dominant they lack humanity. Given this, any Stephen F. Austin would justifiably never have to acknowledge the existence of these “lacking” people nor would his progeny in the future in the TEKS.

Fredrickson (1971) in *The Black Image in the White Mind: The Debate*, Finkelman (2003) in *Defending Slavery: Proslavery Thought in the Old South*, and Dirck (2012) in *Abraham Lincoln and White America* all argue that between 1619 and 1914 an overall White outlook coalesced around the view of Blacks in America which meant that a corresponding one about White developed too. This narrative in the everyday lived culture played out in three intersubjective social, economic, political and geographic questions: 1) What did Whites and Blacks each believe about themselves in their relations with Whites and Blacks in a democratic constitutional republic? 2) What position will Blacks hold in this American society, given that the minority of Blacks is free while 95% of Blacks are enslaved? 3) How did Stephen F. Austin interact with White and Black contemporaries? These important questions pertain to Stephen F. Austin because in his life from 1793 to 1836 he was confronted with the intertwined very

important questions of the morality of enslaving Blacks and the constitutionality of enslaving Blacks that permeated the affairs of the United States and Mexico and, therefore, Austin's Anglo-American settler colony in the Mexican state of Tejas. These questions also pertain to an era of overlapping philosophical thought concerning whiteness and the place of Black people in society that runs from Thomas Jefferson (1743-1826) to John C. Calhoun (1782-1850). All of these famous White American statesmen were contemporaries of Austin, who made public statements about Black enslavement. These are statements about human dignity as pertains to Whites and Blacks, which were statements about the law, religion, society, and geography. The only one of these three White American statesmen whose works or thoughts Austin would not have read would be Lincoln. The Wynterian Approach mandates that the tool of rejection of cruelty be examined in the actions of these men in order to get at intentionality of inflicting pain upon othered humans as though their sufferings mean nothing (McKittrick, 2015; Wynter 2006, 2003, 2000, 1995, 1984). Given what Calhoun and Jefferson and Austin knew about enslavement and the personal, social, political and economic actions through speech and behavior they took, one can see they all chose to ignore the sufferings of enslaved Blacks. To these White men Blacks were intended to be interchangeable parts – non-humans - easily replaced or discarded. Given this, one can state that they forsook the Wynterian Approach tool of rejection of cruelty, because to use it would have created a contested space of totally inclusive human-ness that each of them was not prepared to live under.

Thomas Jefferson, author of the *Declaration of Independence* and third US President, wrote about his complicated feelings and thoughts concerning the actual humanity of Black slaves and Free Blacks in *Notes on the State of Virginia* in 1787. Jefferson did not believe that Blacks had the mental capacity to perform as well as Whites. Jefferson was deeply involved in the pro-slavery compromises of the Constitutional Convention that permitted the slaveholding White landowners to hold majority power in the Congress as they were permitted to count 60% of the enslaved Black American population for purposes of representational apportionment in the House of Representatives. In addition, Jefferson did not believe that Whites would accept Free Blacks as equals and would exterminate them unless Free Blacks were removed from the territory of the US and sent to Africa. As a result of this belief Jefferson was a supporter of the American Colonization Society/ACS founded in 1816 as an organization that wanted to free Black slaves and then send them to Africa, where the ACS had negotiated a colony, Liberia, where they could enjoy full rights as free Black men and Black women (Finkelman 2003).

John C. Calhoun, a former Vice President of the US under Andrew Jackson and a long-time US Senator from South Carolina, who created the doctrine of nullification that primarily served as a defense of slave states that did not agree with decisions reached by a majority of the states. The doctrine of nullification stated that each state had the constitutional right to ignore any federal law since the United States – the federal

government - only exists by agreement of the states – creators of the federal government. Calhoun was also a strong supporter of US annexation of Texas as a slave state. In short this was a clever way to always warn the US that the slaveholding states could walk out and leave the US without a huge stranglehold on the production of cotton as a cash crop. The problem with the doctrine of nullification is that it persists in creating an always looming constitutional crisis (Finkelman 2003). With the examples of Thomas Jefferson and John C. Calhoun one finds that were these men and their ideas mentioned in the 4th and 7th grade Texas social studies curricula then doors open for related discussions about how US inhabitants construct and think about interdisciplinary topics of race, whiteness, safe space, positionality, human dignity, and human rights. Remember that Jefferson and Calhoun along with the actions of the Texas State Board of Education concerning curriculum making and teacher hiring leaves “common sense” understandings of how to do things quite unchallenged.

Wynter (2006; 1997; 1995; 1992[1990]) comes after Jefferson and Calhoun yet her scholarship resonates with a critical dissecting of their ideas, because their ideas are indicative of the NCM to which Wynter refers as being the highly flexible set of ideas that constitutes a globe-penetrating dominant discourse that destroys all other discourses that it encounters. This dominant discourse is known as “White Supremacy.” Wynter astutely examines how Shakespeare used the idea of the savage in his play, *The Tempest*, to illustrate that dangers of dark-skinned savages to the pure longings of some whites.

Wynter explains how the savage was derived from the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church and later the same idea of people being divided between those who were spiritually dedicated and those who were slaves to the devouring of flesh later became a whiteness/blackness dichotomy built on gradually emerging ideas of how the universe really worked. A shift from the sanctification of everything to the secularization of everything played a key role with the acceptance of the ideas of the Catholic cleric-astronomer Copernicus, who postulated that the Earth did revolve around the Sun, which was even more reason to remain in awe of God's awesome power to keep the Earth a stable place that provides for all human needs. Wynter's argument for the co-existent duality of the past sanctification giving way to modern secularization represents then, a challenge to both Jefferson's and Calhoun's convergent ideas that Blacks are inferior and ought to be "natural slaves" to Whites and that slavery is a "positive good" while it holds the seeds of destruction for the nation of the United States. The Grand Narrative of White Supremacy propels Columbus to conquer yet the same narrative compels Columbus' contemporary Roman Catholic Bishop De las Casas to defend the humanity of the Indios whom Columbus had exploited with the Roman Catholic Church's blessing. Here lies the strength of the Wynterian Approach.

The topics – De las Casas, Jefferson, Calhoun, nullification, human dignity, natural slaves, Copernicus, grand narrative - mentioned above do not appear in the 4th and 7th grade official curricula for Texas (TEKS). This means that the "common sense"

understandings are never challenged in the official curriculum. These questions appear nowhere in the state-approved Texas social studies instructional materials for the 4th and 7th grade curricula officially state-adopted by elected state School Board of Education (SBOE). These officially SBOE-adopted instructional materials: *Texas History* published by McGraw Hill Education for the 7th grade, *Texas History* published by Pearson Education, and *Texas History* published by Houghton Mifflin Harcourt and *Texas Studies Weekly* for the 4th grade seem to overlook the three intersubjective questions and the interdisciplinary topics mentioned above in a direct manner; however, by ignoring these questions the silences speak volumes. The possibility of creating numerous counter-narrative lessons that address the topics and questions above is a potentially rich open field of research, development, and study.

In general, Stephen F. Austin is presented in curricula and school texts as a good man doing good things against great odds for success. Effectively Austin is a saint being canonized in for secular consumption. Curricula are not naturally occurring beasts because they are the constructions of human beings who have an outcome in mind. There is no such debate about Stephen F. Austin good or bad? Rugg, however, points out a critical potential harm to developing and implementing a dynamic curricula – teachers who are not well-educated in the disciplines that comprise social studies and teachers that are intellectually incurious and so easily engage in a common sense approach to teaching and learning that do nothing to develop analytical skills and face deeply troubling

questions from the past and present from multiple perspectives. Should not highly qualified teachers be able to expand the scope of the Texas state curricula concerning Austin? The construction of the representation of Stephen F. Austin for Texas Social Studies exists within this milieu of ideas. Note that the representation of Stephen F. Austin exists as a relational item. Stephen F. Austin exists in the Texas State Social Studies Curriculum (TEKS) at the 4th grade and 7th grade level as “significant individual” whose contributions must be learned.

In the official Austin Independent School District instructional materials for Social Studies adoptions at the 4th grade and 7th grade levels Stephen F. Austin can be described by three interlocking themes: 1) The Father of Texas; 2) The Empresario; 3) The Populist and Statesman. Given these representations of Stephen F. Austin one must ask why and how these dominant images came to dominate and in Texas education at the 4th and 7th grade levels? Also, one must ask what images are excluded. Stuart Hall asserts that representations exist always in relation to other images (Hall 1997).

As for the mass consumption of Stephen F. Austin there are several taxpayer-supported state-sanctioned institutions that carry the name of the “Father of Texas.” Stephen F. Austin State University in Nacogdoches, Texas was founded in 1923 as a teacher’s college. The motto of the university is: “Striving for personal excellence in everything we do.” It is an independent university meaning that it is not affiliated with any of Texas’ university systems (www.sfasa.edu).

Another public institution carrying the name of Stephen F. Austin is the Stephen F. Austin High School founded in 1881 in Austin Independent School District in Austin Texas. The school's motto is "Loyal Forever" (www.austinsd.org). What is notable is that there is nothing on the website about when the years that the school was racially segregated until 1972. Kealing High School now Kealing Middle School was the designated Black high school while Austin High School was for Whites only. Both institutions were supported by taxpayer dollars. There is no information about the school's namesake. If there were any relevant honest information about Stephen F. Austin then it would explain how racial segregation was supported by the school's namesake icon.

Another public institution is Stephen F. Austin State Park located in San Felipe, Texas is on the site that Stephen F. Austin chose to establish the headquarters and capital of his Austin Colony where he settled 297 families between the Brazos and Colorado Rivers. This area is known as the Cradle of Texas Liberty (www.twpd.texas.gov). There is no mention on this website about when Black taxpayers were first admitted to use the park on an equal basis as White taxpayers. There is no information about the park's namesake.

In all of these public displays of Stephen F. Austin as an icon, Wynter (2006; 1997; 1995; 1992/1990) argues that these are examples of transformation from a theocratic society to a secular society. Stephen F. Austin is presented as being an absolute. This

means that his image or any reference to him in name with or without a marker is meant to symbolize him as legitimate leader from the past who still holds relevance for us today. As a secular symbol, and non-religious icon, Stephen F. Austin an image of the White man as deserving of mass public respect because of the virtues he represents – hard work, adventurer, rules follower, defender of the public good whatever that may be.

The Official Instructional Materials: Stephen F. Austin for Classrooms

These instructional materials were adopted by the State Board of Education through the Texas Education Agency approved official social studies instructional materials vendors list. *Texas History* (2015) by McGraw Hill Education, *Texas History* (2015) by Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, and *Texas History* (2015) by Pearson Education for the seventh (7th) grade and *Texas Studies Weekly* (2015) by American Legacy Publishing, Inc for the fourth (4th) grade. The three intersubjective interrelated questions are not answered in the officially adopted instructional materials. The questions are not answered in the ancillary materials.

- 1) What did Whites and Blacks each believe about themselves in their relations with Whites and Blacks in a democratic constitutional republic?
- 2) What position will Blacks hold in this American society given that the minority of Blacks are free while 95% of Blacks are enslaved?
- 3) How did Stephen F. Austin interact with his White and Black contemporaries?

These important questions pertain to Stephen F. Austin because in his life from 1793 to 1836 he was confronted with the intertwined very important questions of the morality of enslaving Blacks and the constitutionality of enslaving Blacks that permeated the affairs of the United States and Mexico and, therefore, Austin's settler colony in the Mexican province of Texas.

In the official Austin Independent School District instructional materials for Social Studies adoptions at the fourth (4th) grade and seventh (7th) grade levels Stephen F. Austin can be described by three interlocking themes: 1) The Father of Texas and Statesman; 2) The Empresario and Statesman; 3) The Populist and Statesman. These are complex personae but they are handled in a facile mono-cultural manner. These will be examined as "common sense" narrative representations of Stephen F. Austin. Later these same representations will be examined with respect to the linking ideas of whiteness and materialism.

In the fourth (4th) grade instructional materials Stephen F. Austin is presented in a series of related stories that consistently paint him as good man without complexity who is set upon by bad people and irresponsible people who do not speak English and are of a different value system (*Texas Studies Weekly*, 2015). The fourth (4th) grader sees that Stephen F. Austin is a White American English-speaking male who had the patience to observe and learn from the mistakes of Mexicans and other bad untrustworthy people. Given these facts it is clear as to why Stephen F. Austin is the Father of Texas.

In the seventh (7th) grade instructional materials, *Texas History* (2015) by McGraw Hill Education, *Texas History* (2015) by Houghton Mifflin Harcourt and *Texas History* (2015) by Pearson Education– the textbook and the ancillaries Stephen F. Austin is constructed in a barely more complex manner. The student sees a man who was wholly loyal and beholden to his father. Moreover, Stephen F. Austin is painted a man who was able to use his charms to gain the eager assistance of better off men and had it not been for the duty he felt for toward his mother he would not have become entangled in taking over his father’s Spanish land-grant in Texas. The use of his charms is explained as good manners due to a keen sense of observation of cultural norms. We learn that Stephen F. Austin was people-smart. The only thing stated about the enslavement of Blacks was that Austin and Seguin actively supported with success a measure to allow the Mexican state of Texas to have an exemption from the abolition of slavery in Mexico. There is no discussion about the lives of Blacks in Texas as slaves or as free men and women (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt 2015; McGraw Hill 2015; Pearson 2015).

Common Sense Understandings of Stephen F. Austin

There are three themes that emerge from the readings of the texts that refer to how Stephen F. Austin is situated in the 4th and 7th grade Texas social studies State Board of Education-adopted textbooks and in the sites of public memory. The three interlocking themes are: 1) The Father of Texas; 2) The Anglo-American Empresario; 3) The Liberal Populist and Statesman. The three themes are illustrative of what Foucault (1972) states

concerning the quest for truth being a will to power of the truth-seeker. Given that the themes that emerged were a will to power implanted and so exercised by the authors of the text that were found by me, the scholar, the question arises as to what if I had not seen these three particular themes arise from my study and analysis of the textbooks and the sites of public memory then what would have been? This is a question of contingency from which truth cannot escape in the specific sense here that the Texas SBOE-sanctioned state curricula (TEKS) is, too, a form of public memory – a dump of what a given dominant group in Texas thinks or believes is the best and most important social studies information for Texas teachers to teach and for Texas student to learn. Please note that the elected make-up and political viewpoints of the SBOE are key contingent factors as curricula shift occurs depending on a given moment (Apple, 1978; Apple, 1976). Is this the way to build curricula for social studies that actually addresses the real diversity in a consistent manner throughout time? This current curricula has a fairly narrow focus as it is sanctioned by a socially and religiously and politically and economically conservative elected SBOE. Just what points of view are reasonably missing and which points of view were never considered are another focus of this chapter four?

Stephen F. Austin: The Father of Texas

Father of Texas: 4th grade SBOE-adopted Texas state instructional material

What does it mean to be the “Father” of Texas? This is the opening question. Father denotes a man who takes charge and leads, which prevents the family from

becoming lost. In the case of Stephen F. Austin as “Father of Texas” I will first examine how the case is built in the official SBOE-adopted Texas state instructional materials for fourth (4th) grade and seventh (7th) grade.

I read the 4th grade instructional material, *Texas Studies Weekly (TSW)* wherein Texas is first mentioned in TSW, Week 10, Spanish Explorers. Texas receives mention because the argument is constructed that Spain sent out explorers because “of a wave of excitement [that] swept across Europe when people heard about the New World (*TSW*, Week 10, pg. 1).” The TSW then goes on to pose these questions. What should be noted is the tenor of the questions as they appear to direct the student’s imagination down a certain path of what the cultural geographer Yi Fu Tuan (2013[1980]) would call a “landscape of fear.” Such a landscape is a natural environment that is largely unknown – in this case to White Anglo-American settlers - and so causes humans depending on their natural inclination to be more or less cautious and more or less risk-taking. These pertain in particular to the frontier settlement that was Stephen F. Austin’s colony on the edge of Mexico and the United States overlapping with Indian Territory. Here are the questions: “What kind of strange people lived there?”; “Was the land rich with gold and silver?” There is no question to counter the deployed semiotic “strange.” The article goes on to list the reasons that Spain was interested in the New World as “Knowledge, Wealth, Land, Spreading Christianity, and Competition.” Under each of these reasons a short “truism” is offered but no real analysis of any sort. Under “Knowledge: The Spanish

government wasn't just curious; it had other reasons for wanting to know more about this new land." Under "Wealth: New wealth would make Spain a more powerful nation." Under "Land: More land can also make a nation more powerful." Under "Spreading Christianity: Spain was a Catholic nation and believed it was their duty to convert the American Indians to the Catholic faith." Under "Competition: "Portugal, England and France also sent explorers to claim land and settle colonies in what is today called North America (*TSW*, Week 10, pg.1)." These quickly establish why the territory now known as Texas was important. Note that within the TEKS the only mindset that is given any thought yet never explicitly mentioned is that of White Anglo-American settler colonist perspective, which according to Wynter (2006, 1995) is an example of a creation by omission of a less-than-human other. American Indians and Blacks as the less-than-human-other do not merit consideration as any significant action that will harm them or benefit them is inconsequential to the dominant group, White Anglo-American settlers, who were economic liberals.

Stephen F. Austin first receives mention in *TSW*, Week 14 where "Stephen Austin" is mentioned for the first time. The general title for this particular instructional material, *Texas Studies Weekly*, Week 14, is "The Trouble with Texas." What does the title imply? According to the *TSW*: "The year is 1820. Spain has made it clear: They will fight to protect their claim on Texas (pg. 1)." The troubles are listed: "Raids and Fights and Filibuster Trouble" along with "Spain's Solution." These troubles are linked directly to

Spain as was established in *TSW*, Week 10, so there is a continuity of narrative. Due to this continuity Stephen Austin emerges within a definite context of New World colonization tensions heightened by desires of European nations to establish absolute control over an inhabited land area. Under “Raids and Fights” it is stated that “most of the Spanish missions are a failure.” Given this “very few American Indians adopt the Spanish way of life.” As a result, “raiding bands of American Indians attack anytime they want to.” Clearly here the onus of responsibility for the troubles is placed on the backs of the Indigenous Americans who were already here and had their lands invaded by Europeans. The other problem, “Filibuster Trouble” consists of “[people] who entered Spanish territory and fought against Spanish rule.” As a result “Spain had to send troops to run [them] out.” The *TSW*, sums up the problem well when it states that “the Texas frontier is wild and dangerous and Spain can’t control it.” Hence, the need for a solution becomes apparent in the narrative that now will establish the rationale for the necessity of Stephen Austin.

In “The Trouble with Texas” in the article, “Spain’s Solution,” in *TSW*, Week 14, starts by having the students take a look back to examine “conditions in mind (pg. 1).” The *TSW* then asserts “it is easy to understand why Spain decides to let Moses Austin establish a colony in Texas.” Here the students apparently are invited to engage in some historical thinking to establish through analysis of previous narratives that a logical story of progress is taking place (Seixas, 2002, 2000, 1997; Weinberg, 2001a, 2000, 1991; Van

Sledright, 2008, 2002b). What is the logic of allowing Moses Austin to establish a colony? According to the text: “Spaniards and Mexicans did not want to settle Texas.” Another reason was that there were “conflicts with American Indians tribes.” Finally, Spain noted that the “Anglo colonies in Louisiana had been very successful.” With this a rather ominous statement is made: Now the dangerous work of settling Texas begins.”

It is at this point in the narrative that began with “Christopher Columbus was a Failure” in *TSW*, Week 9, the “New World” and went through “La Salle: A Strange Man in a Strange World” in *TSW*, Week 11, to “Spain’s Opinion of Texas” in *TSW*, Week 12 to “Threats to Spain’s Control” in *TSW*, Week 13 to just examined *TSW*, Week 14, “The Trouble with Texas,” wherein the dominant narrative of Stephen Austin as “Father of Texas” now is fleshed out. Already the antecedent reasons for the need of someone like a Stephen Austin has been established.

Under the article title: “Stephen Austin Refuses to Quit!” the reader is presented with a concrete and practical reason Stephen Austin chooses to start the colony his father had received permission to establish and settle: “He needed money, and starting a colony in Texas looked like a good way to earn it (*TSW*, Week 14, pg.2).” What is clear is that Stephen Austin had “his plan to establish a colony approved by Spain.” In addition we learn that “in September he (Austin) found the perfect place...between the Colorado and Brazos rivers.” The verbs of “earn” and “found” imply that Austin did these items himself. Later “Austin’s plan for the colony was [to settle] 300 families, which prompted

Austin “to [go] to New Orleans and buy a ship he [planned] to use to send supplies to his colony.” Alas, Austin experienced “A Streak of Bad Luck” because his first ship did not make it to its destination and his second ship “ran aground on Galveston Island.” Also “the Karankawa made it worse because the colony was on their land, and they attacked the settlement.” Next a series of trials arose that ought to have doomed Austin’s colonizing business venture yet because Austin believed in “Hard Work” it paid off. Just what constituted this “hard work”?

Spain lost control of Texas as Mexico had just won its independence from Spain in a revolution. “Mexico now owned Texas and agreements with the Spanish government were worthless.” The narrative recounts how Austin was forced to go to Mexico City where he would try to get permission to establish a colony he’d already started and that “Austin did not speak Spanish.” This section concludes by stating “Austin spent more than a year in Mexico.” During which time he learned Spanish and the narrative then explains that “two groups were fighting for control of the Mexican government.” Under the headline: “Austin’s Hard Work Pays Off” we learn that Austin spent over a year in Mexico City as he “finally received permission to continue his work and his settlers were given proof that they owned their land.” Austin returned to his colony where he “established new rules that required colonists to be hardworking and dependable.” Finally we are told that Austin’s selfless leadership paid off as “he organized trade with the

United States to get the goods his people needed and “life at the colony improved – a successful colony in Texas was underway.”

In *TSW*, Week 15: “Austin Turns Against Mexico!” the case is made in chronological order as to what factors lead Austin to turn against Mexico. It states that “Stephen Austin was a strong supporter of the Mexican government in 1822, [because] Mexico did good things for the colonists.” This text points out that “by 1830 there were more than 20,000 Americans in Texas. They outnumbered the Spanish-speaking Texans (Mexicans/Tejanos) by five to one. Corn was the biggest crop, but cotton was growing.” Under the headline: “Seeds of Trouble” the narrative shows how a gradual rift began to grow between Austin and his support of Mexico. The trouble begins with the problems of criminal immigrants – “mountain men and frontiersmen who did not like any government” and the problem of Texas’ distance from the main institutions of government and order – courts as “the nearest court office was more than 500 miles away.” The third problem was that of the government of Mexico that had two groups – one wanted a strong central government” and “the other wanted Texans to have more freedom.” Austin defended the Mexican government and he helped, as an empresario, defeat other rebellious American empresarios, such as Haden Edwards.

In *TSW*, Week 15 the article is titled: “Rebellion in Texas” (pgs. 2, 3). The case for Stephen Austin as “Father of Texas” continues to be made. The circumstances are presented as to why Austin came to support an independent Republic of Texas free of

Mexico as a mother country. The rebellion is traced from the Law of 1830 which topped [American] immigration into Texas through to the Turtle Bayou Resolutions which are not named through Austin's imprisonment to his return to his colony and as convinced revolutionary. Although the Turtle Bayou Resolutions are not mentioned by name the text states: "In 1832 the Texans wrote out what they wanted from the Mexican government. Stephen Austin was chosen to be the person who would deliver this news to President Santa Anna of Mexico. Austin and Santa Anna meet with "Santa Anna agreeing to many of the requests." The problem that arose that proved to be Austin's breaking point was that a letter he wrote in Mexico City and sent to his colony in Texas was intercepted and Austin was accused by Santa Anna of potential treason and arrested. "Austin spent the next year and half in and out of jail." In 1834, Austin was released from prison and Santa Anna "forced out the Mexican president and took control of the government. He was now a dictator." Austin returned to Texas ready for rebellion. This is how the narrative establishing Austin as "Father of Texas" in the 4th grade appears. The term "Father of Texas" does not appear anywhere in the instructional materials.

Father of Texas: 7th grade SBOE-adopted Texas state instructional materials

There are three 7th grade SBOE-adopted Texas state instructional material textbooks: *Texas History* published by Houghton Mifflin Harcourt (Houghton, 2015); *Texas History* published by Pearson Education (Pearson, 2015); and *Texas History* published by McGraw Hill Education (McGraw, 2015). In the McGraw Hill Education's

Texas History (p. 190) there is a “Texas Biography” that states: “Stephen F. Austin is often considered “the Father of Texas for his work in establishing the first Anglo American colony and then helping to form the Republic.” The portrait then begins to enumerate the actions that Austin undertook which prove the assertion that he is the state’s “Father.” It states: “When Mexican officials began putting restrictions on colonization he traveled to Mexico City in 1822, a journey of about 1000 miles/1609 kilometers. In 1833 Austin again traveled to Mexico City to deliver petitions for Texas settlers seeking freedoms. In 1834 Austin was arrested and held in prison for a year. Austin returned to Texas in 1835 and joined the movement for independence and fought in the Texas Revolution, he served as the first secretary of state and died in January of 1836.”

In both *Pearson* (2015) and *Houghton* (2015) it never states that Stephen F. Austin is the “Father of Texas;” however, it does create a strong case for Austin as undertaking actions of a founding leader. The textbook *Pearson* does state that “Stephen F. Austin Takes Control (p.111)” while *Houghton* states “Stephen F. Austin Takes Over (p.164).” *Pearson* proceeds to explain that “Austin explores the territory” choosing the “rich lands between the Colorado River and Brazos River” because the “land was ideal for agriculture” and it was far from the Comanche in the region (p.112).” *Houghton* quotes Austin: “The Prairie comes to the river...and affords a most beautiful situation for a Town or settlement. Land all first rate, plenty of timber, fine water – beautifully (p.165)”

From here, *Pearson* states that Austin arranged for a supply ship for his settlers and most importantly “Austin and [Mexican] government officials created a loophole, allowing colonists to keep their slaves (p.113).” Austin travels to Mexico City and “finds the Mexican government in turmoil.” Given this Austin “sought out [Mexican] leaders to present his plan while learning about the Mexican people (114).” *Houghton* states that “in March 1822 Austin set out for Mexico City for a journey of over 1000 miles. Once in Mexico City found officials struggling to organize a new government (p.167).” *Pearson* states that by 1823 Austin received approval for his colony. When back in the colony Austin established a San Felipe de Austin in 1823 to serve as the heart of the colony (p.116).” Austin stated that “he owed loyalty and gratitude to Mexico.” *Houghton* states: “In the end Austin’s colony was the only one ever to operate under the Imperial Colonization Law, which allowed Austin to maintain his colony (p.167).”

Pearson (2015) offers an analysis of the different reasons for settlement which explains the underlying causes of the eventual break between Mexico and Texas. Austin as an empresario was at the heart of these developments. After the Convention of 1833 Austin was chosen to travel to Mexico City to present the petition of grievances to Santa Anna. Austin apparently “spoke bluntly and warned Mexico’s failure to act on the proposals could lead Texans to take actions (p.146).” *Houghton Mifflin Harcourt* (2015) states that Austin set out for Mexico City to present the reforms suggested by the Convention of 1833 (p.211). *Pearson* (2015) states: “Santa Anna agreed to cancel Law of

1830 that ended US immigration into Texas but Texas would remain part of Coahuila (p. 146).” Austin is imprisoned as he writes a letter to Texas leaders advocating independence for Texas a state in Mexico that is viewed as seditious, whereupon, he is held from January 1834 to August 1835 (p. 148).” *Houghton Mifflin Harcourt* (2015) parallels by stating: Austin was arrested as Mexican officials had read his letter advising Texans to “meet without a moment’s delay for the purpose of organizing a local government for Texas (p. 214).” *Pearson* (2015) states that when Austin returns to Texas he states: “War is our only resource. There is no other remedy. We must defend our rights, ourselves, and our country by force of arms (p.148).” After the Texas Revolution starts, “Austin is sent as a diplomatic envoy to the United States to obtain a loan (p.153).” Later Austin was chosen as the commander of the Texas volunteer army where he deploys soldiers. Finally, after the Revolution is won, Austin is named to be the first secretary of state but soon thereafter in December 1836 (p.182). *Houghton Mifflin Harcourt* (2015), too, agrees that “Stephen F. Austin was named secretary of state and served the Republic for only a few months before dying as a result of overwork and exposure to the cold which had given him pneumonia (p. 260).”

An important but overlooked moment in Texas history could easily be Stephen F. Austin’s absences as proof of his importance as the Father of Texas. In the *McGraw Hill Education* (2015) textbook the heading “A Difficult Beginning” shows the importance of Austin in his absence in that “in 1822...the new Mexican government would not respect

the colony's land agreements that had been approved by Spain. Austin made the 1000 mile trip to Mexico City...staying in Mexico City for a year. He learned Spanish making it easier for him to speak directly with [Mexican leaders] and gaining an understanding of Mexican culture (*McGraw Hill Education*, 2015, p.193).” “[Because of Austin’s] determination and interactions with the government...a law was passed in 1823 that granted Austin a contract for his colony (*McGraw Hill Education*, 2015, p.193).” Another spin on Austin’s first trip to Mexico City to secure his colony is given in *Pearson* (2015) that states: “The new leaders in Mexico City did not like Austin’s plan. His contract to create a colony in Texas was in danger. Austin decided to go to Mexico City. Austin sought out the leaders and presented his plan for his colony. As time dragged on he ran out of money and had to borrow money but he used the time to learn about the Mexican people and their government. In 1823, Austin received approval for his colony. The deal he received was better now than before (*Pearson*, 2015, p.114).” In, *Houghton Mifflin Harcourt* (2015) it states: “Austin needed the support of the new Mexican government. He headed to Mexico City to convince government leaders to approve his colony. The journey was more than 1000 miles through dangerous land. Austin was determined to wait as long as it took...he studied Spanish to become fluent. Austin’s patience paid off. As the colony’s leader he would receive 100000 acres for settling 300 families. He was determined to work with Mexican officials which won him success (*Houghton Mifflin Harcourt*, 2015, p.166-167).”

The time Austin was arrested by Santa Anna from October 1834 to July 1835, “local officials at various Texas towns began to press for Austin’s freedom (*McGraw Hill Education*, 2015, p.228).” Because of this agitation from “political leaders and lawyers who travelled to Mexico City to help” Austin was finally released (McGraw Hill Education 2015, p.229). The *Pearson* (2015) text states that Austin was arrested after making a presentation to Santa Anna about desired reforms in governing Tejas and links Austin’s imprisonment in Mexico City to “reforms made by the rulers of Coahuila u Tejas...the ban was lifted on new settlers from the United States...the number of local courts were increased [in Tejas]...Texas was divided into three departments giving the settlers a greater sense of self-government (*Pearson*, 2015, p.146).” In the *Houghton Mifflin Harcourt* (2015) textbook, it states: “Austin was finally able to meet with Santa Anna, [who] agreed to nearly all of the resolutions of the Convention of 1833 – allow immigration from the United States, lower taxes on US imports but Texas must remain part of Coahuila. Austin was arrested on his way back to Texas because he had written a letter that had challenged Mexican authority (*Houghton Mifflin Harcourt*, 2015, p.214). The key point here that the elected SBOE wanted to re-enforce is that Austin did get most of the reforms agreed to and the theme of Stephen F. Austin as “Father of Texas” stands unchallenged in the three seventh grade *Texas History* textbooks written, seemingly uncritically, to support the TEKS.

Stephen F. Austin : Anglo-American Empresario

Anglo-American Empresario: 4th grade SBOE-adopted Texas state instructional materials

Stephen Austin was an empresario. According to the fourth (4th) grade *Texas Studies Weekly* (2015), how does the iconography of Austin as an empresario appear? First, in *TSW*, Weekly 14, which is about Stephen Austin, the term “empresario” does not appear. There is no description of Austin going to Mexico to secure his father’s legacy of a landgrant. In addition, there is no mention of the legislation passed by the Mexican Congress to create the position of empresario. An empresario, according to Haley (2003) in his mini-biography of Stephen F. Austin, is “a general land manager of broad powers and with unlimited oversight from the government.” Now this term empresario does appear in *TSW* (2015), Weekly 15, where it states, “When a fellow empresario started a rebellion against Mexico, Austin organized a militia to stop him (pg.1).”

Given that there is no concrete definition of empresario in the fourth grade text, *Texas Studies Weekly*, does it follow one cannot infer what an empresario is and does from descriptions of Austin’s actions concerning the governance of his colony and his handling of issues with American Indians and how he handles the government of Mexico between 1822 and 1837. What is important here in terms of chronological history is to make a distinction between the time before Austin is an empresario – 1821 to 1822 - to the time he becomes an empresario – 1822 to 1835 - to the time he becomes a rebel

populist – 1835 to 1836. Can these distinctions be seen in the decisions that Austin makes in the 4th grade text of *TSW*?

In *TSW* (2015), Week 16, the title of this issue is: “Looking Back: European Exploration to Texas Revoltion” there is an excellent summation and overview called an article: “Texas, Our Texas.” Here Austin’s actions are clearly located within the Western European colonization movement. Before Austin was an empresario it states: “Moses Austin died...it was up to his son Stephen F. Austin to carry on with the plan.” Followed by “Austin was given permission from Spain to bring 300 Anglo families to settle his colony in Texas.” The great geographic break and political break occurs: “Spain lost control of Texas when Mexico won its independence. Suddenly, Austin had to get permission from an entirely new government to establish his colony. He spent more than a year in Mexico trying to convince [Mexico’s] leaders that the colony was a good idea.” At this point the 4th grade text only offers a year, 1822, embedded in the text. Here is the point where Stephen F. Austin is an empresario as made by the Imperial Colonization Law of 1823, which is not mentioned in the 4th grade texts. No specific enabling laws are mentioned in the fourth 4th grade TEKS nor instructional materials.

As empresario, which is not mentioned, “Austin finally received permission to continue the work of populating his colony.” It follows by stating that “Austin took control” and “made peace treaties with American Indian tribes and made rules for the colony [wherein only] dependable hardworking settlers were welcome.” As an

empresario Austin was entrenched in the politics of Mexico's central government and Mexico's exterior province of *Tejas*. Given this the comment "Stephen Austin supported the Mexican government in 1822 [as] Austin was happy with the way the colonists were treated at first." The *TSW* then notes a shift in the relationship and perception due to "Texas [growing] larger" and "government leaders in Mexico kept changing." As a result of this turmoil "Mexico passed a law that stopped immigration into Texas." The story of the looming crisis, "Turmoil in Texas" then is recounted.

The *TSW* (2015) reports that "Santa Anna took control of the government and he expected everybody to obey his every rule." As a result "Texans held a convention in 1832 and elected Stephen F. Austin as president." The issues are stated that the Texans wanted Santa Anna to address: "Permission to govern themselves as a separate Mexican state." These issues infuriated Santa Anna. Austin was imprisoned in 1833 after meeting with Santa Anna in Mexico City. "Stephen F. Austin was released from prison after a year and a half. He had once been loyal to Mexico, but Austin now knew the Texans could no longer live under Mexican rule."

Anglo-American Empresario: 7th grade SBOE-adopted Texas state instructional materials

As empresario Austin was an official of the government of Mexico granted broad powers to govern and settle his landgrant colony. Because the original landgrant for Austin's Colony had come from Spain, a problem arose in that Mexico was a new nation

independent of Spain. *Houghton Mifflin Harcourt* (2015) states: “Austin needed the support of the new Mexican government in order to start his colony. In the end Austin’s colony was the only one ever to operate under the Imperial Colonization Law, which allowed Austin to maintain his colony (p.166-167).” *Pearson* (2015) states: “Mexico won its independence from Spain in 1821. The new leaders in Mexico City did not like Austin’s plan which put his contract for his colony in danger. Given this, Austin decided to travel to Mexico City. He used his time in Mexico City to learn about the Mexican people and the government. By 1823 Austin received approval for his colony (p. 114).

The *Houghton Mifflin Harcourt* (2015) textbook states that some of the farmer settlers were slaveowners (p.169). The large-scale cotton farming led to an expansion of slavery in Texas (p,197). The *Pearson* (2015) book states that slavery was illegal but that Austin and Mexican government officials had found a loophole to allow colonists to keep their slaves (p.113). As an empresario one of Austin’s duties was to raise a militia and function as colonel in the army. In *Houghton* we are told that Haden Edwards, an empresario, became agitated at the Mexican government that declared their land contracts no longer existed. Stephen F. Austin called out the militia to crush Edwards attempt at forming a new state (p.203). In *Pearson* (2015), we are told that Edwards refused to honor old land contracts and so he tries to cancel them. Edwards declared his Republic of Fredonia, which triggered Austin to call out the militia and put an end to this problem (p.118).

Stephen F. Austin: The Liberal Populist Statesman

Liberal Populist Statesman: 4th grade SBOE-adopted Texas state instructional materials

To get at the Populist iconography of Stephen F. Austin the *TSW* is not available. Therefore the book, *Stephen F. Austin and the Founding of Texas* (Haley, 2003), which was written for young readers for the Rosen Publishing firm will be used. Rosen publishes for struggling readers and juvenile history stories. By “Populist” I mean that Austin sought to serve the interests of the majority of the Anglo-American white settler population of his colony, in particular. The shift to “Rebel” indicates that Austin meshed the welfare of his colonists with those of other Anglo-American settlers in Texas, which included the hardworking settlers as well as the frontiersman and squatters, who sought absolute freedom from governmental authority. This portrait of Austin begins only after his meeting with Santa Anna, because “Austin quickly perceived Santa Anna’s real intentions to claim to be a liberal and federalist while aiming to become a centralist dictator (p.53).” To demonstrate Austin’s first step to situating himself as a populist/rebel we find “Austin wrote a letter advising his friends, Anglo-Americans, to form an independent state of Texas [within Mexico] (p.53).” For this act of sedition under Mexican law Austin was arrested by Santa Anna and imprisoned in 1833 until 1835. Upon returning to Texas, “Austin agreed that war was the only choice (p.55).” After this Austin was made general of the volunteer army in October 1835. From this point Austin

is involved in the Revolution and serves as the ad interim government of the Texas Republic's ambassador to the USA seeking support for the rebellion against Mexico. In seeking financial and political support in the northern and New England states Austin made comments like this: "[The Texas conflict] is waged by the mongrel Spanish-Indian and Negro race against civilization and the Anglo-American race (p.78)."

Liberal Populist Statesman: 7th grade SBOE-adopted instructional materials

What is significant here is that all three texts mention these significant breaks that ruptured the servility that Austin usually showed to the Mexican government in his official position as empresario. The first is the Law of April 6, 1830. *McGraw Hill Education* (2015) states this "law outlawed immigration from the United States and forbade enslaved people from being brought into Texas (p, 220-221)." *Houghton Mifflin Harcourt* (2015) states that "the law was intended to strictly control the American presence in Texas (p.205)." *Pearson* (2015) states that "the law banned bringing slaves into Texas. The aim of the law was to bind Texas more to the central government (p.138). The effect of this law was to make Anglo-American settlers concerned that their human property would actually be inviolate as in the USA. In addition, this was a clash of cultures in a peripheral area wherein the cultures of the US and Mexico and the American Indians and Black slaves were so mixed that this imposition of a "pure" culture in the form of centralism as opposed to continued laissez faire liberalism and federalism were resented mightily.

The second break were the political conventions of 1832 and 1833. The aim of both of these was to reform the Mexican central government to permit the states of Mexico to have more autonomy to determine their own internal trade policies. In *McGraw Hill Education* (2015) the Convention of 1832 was a meeting of Anglo-American settlers with Austin in San Felipe (p.226). In *Pearson* (2015), it states the delegates to the convention of 1832 demanded renewed immigration from the United States into Texas and that Texas become an independent state in Mexico (p.144). In *Houghton Mifflin Harcourt* (2015), it states that the Convention of 1832 issued four reforms that were never presented to the central government in Mexico City (p.212). The follow-up Convention of 1833 issued the same four reforms: 1) Allow immigration from the United States; 2) Texas be made a separate state from Coahuila; 3) Customs duties be removed for three years; 4) Land for public schools. *McGraw Hill Education* (2015), *Houghton Mifflin Harcourt* (2015), and *Pearson* (2015) all concur on these points. What they all, also, agree upon is that Stephen F. Austin, the elected president of the Convention of 1833, is sent to Mexico City to meet with President Santa Anna. This event leads to the most significant break.

The third break was the arrest of Stephen F. Austin after meeting with President Santa Anna and successfully discussing the reform demands of the Texans. *McGraw Hill Education* (2015), *Houghton Mifflin Harcourt* (2015), and *Pearson* (2015) all agree that Santa Anna had agreed to allow the following reforms to occur: 1) renewed immigration

from the United States into Texas; 2) the customs duty would be lowered; 3) English could be the official language of government of Texas. The problem that arose was that before Austin met with Santa Anna he met with Vice-President Farias with whom Austin stated that if the reforms were not met then there would be serious trouble in Texas. This angered Farias who viewed this as a threat. Austin upon being dismissed wrote an angry letter to his supporters in Texas telling them to prepare to become an independent state within Mexico. This letter was intercepted and viewed as sedition. Austin was then arrested and put in different prisons without being officially charged with a crime. Austin was imprisoned from January 1834 to October 1835. Because of his horrific experiences he chose to support war as the only proper response to Mexican aggression.

In both the 4th grade and 7th grade instructional materials, Stephen F. Austin's iconic image does not vary. The key point seems to be that a continuity be maintained that does not disturb the few remembrances of Stephen F. Austin that a 4th grader will carry in her/his head to 7th grade. The TEKS emphasize that they seek to establish a continuity in the curriculum such that even the curriculum is a journey of progress. For a teacher with any desire to prepare students for future endeavors a necessary deviation into the applying the social studies skills and citizenship skills, which already exist, would elevate the rigor by investing the courses with more twenty-first century skills.

Stephen F. Austin in the Sites of Memory

There are three sites of public memory – 1) The Bob Bullock Texas State History Museum; 2) The Texas State Cemetery; 3) The State Capitol - that will be examined to see whether Stephen F. Austin is represented within the confines of the common sense narrative or problematized by being placed within an alternative cultural model. In all of these sites Stephen F. Austin is presented as a great man. These sites are not meant to be controversial but rather are to be viewed with some reverence.

An issue that runs through all sites of public memory is the issue of iconography. This is a concept that is borrowed from cultural geography. The concept has to do with the control of imagery. Can iconography provide a thick description (Geertz, 1973) of an event? According to Giddens the purpose of controlling the image is to control its placement in time and space and to retain control over the information that the image elevated to icon represents. A thick description would assume that the icon has a rich “life history” assuming one would do the research to expose the many ways the image elevated to icon has shifted in meaning. The purpose of iconography is to create an *idée fixe* which must be artificial as a fixed idea is static and effectively dead as it is unchanging, which goes against humanity given that humans are dynamic and moving and diffuse ideas wherever they go. Iconography must be demystified in order to become useful and less dangerous (Cosgrove and Daniels, 1988). Iconography is dangerous with sites of public memory as these sites are often used to educate the public about an idea or person or event. If the idea or person or event has been elevated to the status of icon then

by definition it ceases to be of real true use to education. Instead it becomes a piece of propaganda. The most awesomely dangerous form of iconography would be propaganda because this allows humans to be distorted for easy assimilation into a mirage of false definitions and false consciences and will lead to dysconsciousness (King, 1990) – a habit of accepting ideas and symbols at face value no matter how harmful the idea is to one's self to humanity.

The Bob Bullock Texas State History Museum presents the images of Stephen F. Austin as struggling empresario who is falsely imprisoned on the orders of Santa Anna for daring to use his American right to free speech disagreeing with actions of the government of Mexico. Here a model of Austin's prison cell in Mexico City is shown along with a writing desk he used in his cabin in San Felipe the capital of his colony. After that a display is shown explaining that Austin was elected as Commander of the Texas Volunteer Army. There is nothing to cause the visitor to the museum to wonder about alternative points of view because the visitor only sees that Austin was working hard against evil forces to make Texas a better place to live for his settlers. The setting is awe-inspiring as one enters this august state institution under the shadow of a giant steel Lone Star. Frequently visitors to the museum stand under this giant iconographic symbol of Texas to take pictures to prove that, indeed, they were in Texas. The entrance forum of the Bob Bullock Texas State History Museum is done in black marble with an intricate inlay of the six flags that flew over Texas. There is long spiraling staircase that one can

take up to the second floor and the third floor. One is easily overcome by the bigness and all of the filled space as well as the Texas hospitality one receives from the security staff to the volunteer docents who lead tours to the ticket takers who greet everyone with a smile and twinkle in her/his eye. The placement of the Stephen F. Austin's display which shows his prison cell in Mexico City is enveloped in dark hues letting the museum visitor know that this is a precarious moment in Stephen F. Austin's life. Gradually upon emerging from this dark and ominous corner of this specifically Stephen F. Austin display one is bathed in light. This light represents freedom and the air of possibility. Why? Because at this moment Stephen F. Austin returns to his colony in Texas to advocate for the secession of Mexican Texas, now with Anglo-Americans in the majority of the population, from Mexico. Thereafter, there is a display with a film that highlights Stephen F. Austin's military role in the secession from Mexico struggle. One gets the feeling that Stephen F. Austin was a great man, who sacrificed a large amount of his life for the birth of the nation of the Republic of Texas. After this Austin is mentioned no more as he dies in December 1836 shortly after losing the first presidential election of the Republic of Texas to Sam Houston (Bob Bullock handouts 2015; Davis field notes 2015).

At the Texas State Cemetery Austin is mentioned in the gallery as the Father of Texas and a great statesman. On the tour his grave is marked by a tall pink granite monument that towers above the other graves in the cemetery. The tour guide presents Austin as a hardworking honest man without whom Texas would have never existed.

This deterministic statement means that there is no hint of any topic being brought up that could detract from Stephen F. Austin as an icon of perfection. This is a precision maintained homage to many famous Texans who lost their lives fighting for a belief that the majority of Texans treasured. The verdant lawns are trimmed with care and one can note that there are no weeds around any of the graves. This is a sacred space designed to inspire respect and tears and possibly inspire visitors to the beauty of a life in public service. At the entrance to the left is a gallery that contains a brief but well-explained history of Texas – meticulously cleaned and dust-free. The staff members are welcoming and greet anyone who desires a tour with respect as they usher them into the distinctively sacred story of Texas. At Stephen F. Austin's grave one gets an overwhelming sense of his power as his statue looks out over the cemetery on top of its huge expertly cut pink Texas granite casement (Walker & Erwin, 2011; Davis fieldnotes, 2015).

At the State Capitol a statue of Stephen F. Austin greets the visitors in the lobby. The statue is by Elisabeth Ney. The statue sits in the main entrance to the state capital building. The white marble sculpture is of a vigorous Stephen F. Austin wearing a buckskin fringed top high leather boots holding a rifle and a piece of cloth. This is a masculine image of a male in the frontier which suggests bravery and honesty and self-confidence. The tour guide asks whether the visitors know who Austin was and then explain to that he is the Father of Texas. The statue has vague fierceness to it that embodies the virile masculinity of the Texas frontier and recalls the needed internal

fortitude that Stephen F. Austin needed to lead a colony into a thriving existence and the endurance necessary to deal with the politics of Mexico and balance that against the freedom-loving aspirations of his settlers. The room in which Austin's statue is contained is the very close and packed entrance rotunda. This space is filled with security machines and armed Department of Public Safety Deputies. Not only that there is the feeling of being overwhelmed by art as a large portrait of Davy Crockett dominates one wall and pictures of the first African American legislators in Texas are hung on another wall. Then upon turning left and looking forward one sees the outsized portico that contains an inlay of the six flags of Texas as well as directly in front another statue of Sam Houston next to Stephen F. Austin's (Capitol Visitor Center handouts, 2015; Davis fieldnotes, 2015).

At all three sites the common theme is one of showing respect for the accomplishments of Stephen F. Austin. These three sites do re-enforce the image of Stephen F. Austin as the Father of Texas. All of these spaces could be considered sacred in that they all explain how Texas came into being because of a hardworking man like Austin. We are invited to share in the story of Austin as a great man and the birth of the state of the Texas. What should be noted is that the simplistic common sense narrative of Stephen F. Austin presented for mass consumption in the sites of public memory mirrors the simplistic mass consumption narrative of Stephen F. Austin developed and approved

by the Texas Education Agency and codified in the state-approved curriculum – Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (Davis fieldnotes, 2015).

This chapter has explained how the common sense narrative of Stephen F. Austin came into being. The common sense narratives permeates the Texas landscape. One can experience the grand narrative of Stephen F. Austin and the founding of Texas in taxpayer funded institutions in public education, state universities, state recreation sites, sites of public memory all buttressed by policy imperatives delivered in an American Exceptionalist progressive curriculum that never stops to plant an ounce of doubt about its common sense. What cannot be ignored is the fact that these sites of public memory are subject to the same text reading problems of any other text.

Sites of public memory areas of contested power. In each of the sites of public memory one should wonder who has the right to display heritage and so define heritage in a particular manner? Is it the state of Texas or a small group of people appointed by some unknown person or group? This would be important in injecting some transparency into the process by which these sites of public memory are shaped. Heritage that requires display to get its meanings into the public arena to be shared are part of a body of politics of recognition. This means that the Stephen F. Austin statues and plaques and installations become a part of identity formation for the individual who could come to associate herself or himself with the “person” Stephen F. Austin. In a sites of public memory in which meaning is supposed to be negotiated there ought to be some human

guides and/or written guidelines to thinking complexly about museum displays (Morphy, 2008). This could be a welcomed form of heritage management that could be done from multiple perspectives which in turn could enlist multiple communities to send representatives to become heritage tour guides for a particular heritage.

Do sites of public memory exist to order and reorder knowledge through displays of an array of stuff that the public assumes are important cultural artifacts? Sites of public memory exist as taxpayer supported institutions and as such have a responsibility to articulate a diverse series of cultural and heritage messages simultaneously. This is about material culture on display that then enlists the public to share in an imaginary timeshift as the public interacts with the displays or exhibits or film. Another opportunity exists for the sites of public memory to intentionally engage in a critical historicization of artifacts by establishing “contact zones” within the museum. The purpose of the “contact zone” would be to permit visitors to engage in intercultural and multicultural dialogues about the artifacts and, one hopes, to ask how he/she came to be positioned in such a way to articulate one’s interpretation of a given artifact in such a manner (Clifford, 1988). This would be actually enacting openly Geertz’s (1972) recognition of how local culture somehow gets falsely transformed into a global culture as it was never intended to be. Here is contingency working at its best to challenge all assumptions about arriving at truth as just a simple utterance of those who consider themselves to be protected within the dominant discourse group of society. From here a space opens to ask about what the

curator of a given display expected the artifacts to do. In the case of Stephen F. Austin installations at the Bob Bullock Texas State History Museum the display of Austin's jail cell in Mexico City works wonders as far as generating divergent forms of thinking and interpretation amongst the students (Moutu, 2006)

Left to stand alone the obvious assumption is an unchallenged state institution in and of himself. The associations with Stephen F. Austin show a strong affinity to coopt his great man image and with it the honor, whether deserved or not, that goes with it. To challenge the strong iconography of Stephen F. Austin is a risky undertaking, especially in Texas and, moreover, in Austin, Texas. To challenge provides an opportunity to open a new space for inquiry. We live in this world of thinking that is supposedly flexible yet grounded in real research. The research on Stephen F. Austin rarely seeks to examine him in sustained association free Blacks, enslaved Blacks, and American Indians. This is not a surprise, because Austin's diaries do not mention many encounters he considered to be significant with these groups. If this is the case then the teacher has a duty to reconstruct the zeitgeist of the time in which Austin lived. This would include examinations of the pro-slavery thought of Jefferson, Calhoun and Andrew Jackson not to mention the political writings of Abraham Lincoln. Following Wynter's Approach would always having the scholar looking for new ways to approach and dissect old evils that persist into the present.

The Wynterian Approach Reiterated

The goal of the Wynterian Approach is to deconstruct through excavation the “common sense” of the TEKS as shown in instructional materials that are designed to satisfy the mandates of TEA in the TEKS. There is no point that is too small. What must be noted is that Wynter is not trying to establish a new “common sense” narrative that excludes all other narratives. The Wynterian Approach seeks to establish an array of co-equal contingent narratives that offer multiple perspectives that actually exist in the same spaces in convergent spaces and divergent spaces (Wynter, 1992{1990}; King & Swartz, 2014).

What then are the basic tenets of the Wynterian Approach? The Wynterian Approach holds that narratives presented as “common sense” curriculum must be properly researched to get at the true foundations of the stories. This means that a narrative such as that of Columbus starts with examining Columbus himself. Here we find that Columbus is White male Roman Catholic commoner native of Genoa European literate navigator and cartographer. All of these perspectives are embodied in Columbus and did influence how his contemporary humans view him and treat him as well as determined what opportunities were open to him in the rigidly socially stratified world of the medieval Europe. Next how Columbus’ mentalscape – his subjective understanding - of the world was constructed in the cultures that transmitted to him his palimpsest of values that guided his behaviors and decision-making. This subjective understanding of Columbus that drives his decisions are shaped by his “local culture” – sociogenic

principles – because culture is created by the tensions within a society (Wynter, 1995, 1990; Fanon, 1965; Geertz, 1973). Wynter establishes that human actors in history exist at the center of a convergence of contingent narratives. In other words Wynter echoes Lacan (1972) who states that humans are “known through the gaze of the (m)other.” Given this humans always feel that they “lack” something – status, wealth, beauty, respect, independence - that cannot quite be fulfilled (Wynter, 2000; 1996; Fanon, 1952; Woodson, 1933). Wynter (1992[1990]; 1969; 1968) views these narratives as valid yet she insists on going further. She then asks what do the humans who are experiencing the behaviors targeted at them think. These are counternarratives or alternative cultural models – Black Studies Perspective (BSP) - that are usually ignored. “Black” for the Wynterian Approach is a liminal (Wynter, 1990; British Sociological Association, 2005) term because it the British use of the term which collectively places all non-Whites as Black and therefore to some degree represented as lacking in civilization, education while at the same time “Black” has a sense in the US that tags anyone with any degree of African blood as polluted and demeaned while “Black” in the sense of the Spanish and Portuguese colonies who imported African humans to brutalize as slaves mean a social ethnic group at the bottom of the *casta* – the interlocking social political economic legal theological geographic hierarchy that was brought in and transplanted with Columbus (Burkholder 2013; Cuevas 2004). The BSP, however, for Wynter holds a treasure trove of valid viewpoints that easily get overlooked, ignored, marginalized and erased when a society becomes too narrow-gauged focused on only the “common sense’ narratives as

the sole source of facts and truth. For Wynter (McKittrick, 2015; Wynter, 2006, 2000, 1995, 1983, 1970, 1969, 1968) all human perspectives are valid and can provide an alternative cultural models through which to interpret the world through these now valid perspectives - local state national continental hemispheric global ecological - as opposed to the narrow and exclusionary normative cultural model of Columbus that for gave a worldview that was very deterministic. The Columbus example is very similar to Stephen F. Austin.

The Wynterian Approach is about using academic research from disparate subject disciplines to overcome and resurrect the intentionally forced status of being made voiceless and marginal and having to accept that status because one does not know better. By carefully and deliberately using curriculum and broadening the definition of curriculum to mean any course of thought that encourages consequent actions then one comes to understand how Woodson was correct when he stated that “mis-education” is an intentional construct. Fanon (1952) was correct in identifying “mis-education” from a psychological and colonial perspective when he asserted that social choices about how to represent the past lived existence and the current living existence to a group of people is a choice of the interlocking dominant groups in every given society. This implies that the people (intentionally historically marginalized groups) exposed to this persistent negative harangue turn against themselves an engage in autophobic actions that include embracing negative self-thought and negative group-thought which could lead to a belief that self-

rejection is the only correct way to live and formulate a culture for people who, too, are Black. Wynter brings these scholars together to deeply and critically examine dominant discourses that have come to be the foundation of social studies thought and global constructions of societies, governments, economies, and definitions of success and beauty. This is what the purpose of chapter five will be: To examine Stephen F. Austin using a Wynterian Approach (Wynter, 2006; 2000; 1997; 1995; 1992[1990]; 1969).

Summary

The Wynterian Approach when applied to the instructional materials was used to analyze the three themes – 1) Stephen F. Austin as Father of Texas; 2) Stephen F. Austin as Anglo-American Empresario; 3) Stephen F. Austin as Liberal Populist Stateman - that compliment the iconographic status of Stephen F. Austin that is established in the official state of Texas social studies curricula. The analysis of the findings found that two things occur. The first is a dominant discourse blatantly emerges called by Wynter (1992[1990]) a “native cultural model” that superficially confirms in the instructional materials the lack of depth demanded in the official state curricula. The teacher who follows the curricula as written will find exactly what is stated: Stephen F. Austin is, indeed, a significant individual. Both sets of sites of public memory suffer from the same brutal dreadfulness of being drenched in a superficial narrative that sanctifies Stephen F. Austin as a living god, a hagiography is created, or simply allow the name and image of Stephen F. Austin to stand as unchallenged markers that represent a great man.

Secondly, what emerges, only because the application of the Wynterian Approach, is a much deeper researched reading of Stephen F. Austin that challenges the superficial meaning of “significant individual” upon which Stephen F. Austin’s iconographic status depends. Questions emerge that encourage a counter-narrative to be constructed because the previously unchallenged accepted meaning has become troubled. These counternarrative questions also are countermemory questions that open up a discourse about race, place, and class. These counternarratives matter when the state claims that the purpose of social studies is to prepare students for a challenging future (Brown 2010). These counternarratives matter because they are the “alternative cultural models” that Wynter (1992/1990) refers to in her research which open liminal spaces for new narratives to stand equally alongside “native cultural model” narratives that usually dominate instructional materials. Alternative Cultural Models have this habit of stating the obvious that had for too long gone unstated. In this case the Alternative Cultural Model states that Stephen F. Austin is a White Anglo-American male who chooses to establish a colony in Texas because he sees an opportunity to advance several dominant agendas of the time: Manifest Destiny and White Supremacy. Both of these dominate agendas serve to swaddle Stephen F. Austin in a historical straightjacket, a zeitgeist, that supports a given outlook for White men born of privilege and taught to regard themselves as deserving of that privilege because they are the only humans who exist to keep order and bring progress. These Wynterian Approach (Wynter 1992[1990]) challenges,

alternative cultural models that exist within the native cultural model, only served to examine Stephen F. Austin in more depth – his actions and thoughts.

The next step with the Wynterian Approach is to create an alternative cultural model (ACM) that identify those humans, whom historically and presently White men – the self-proclaimed superior group – such as Stephen F. Austin, made socially dead (Patterson, 1982) and stole their voices - from any narrative and from any possible public memory. For example, the Black human enslaved by Stephen F. Austin, Richmond, would gain voice by examining his zeitgeist through the actions of other similarly situated Black human beings at his time. Only by examining these persons actions can we get at a reasonably defensible possibility of what his thoughts might have been about his horrible living-as-dead existence. Then to check the native cultural model the writings of Stephen F. Austin one finds that Richmond does not figure in his thoughts. In addition, Austin's view of the enslavement of Black human beings was one to allow slavery but not actively cheer for slavery yet lobby for permission for his colonist to bring in Black slaves despite Mexican law forbidding slavery. This is the gap in the official state of Texas social studies curricula at the fourth (4th) and seventh (7th) grade levels – a failure to even attempt to discuss the issue of human dignity surrounding this significant individual – Stephen F. Austin – in his actions and his writings. Another very important issue that the Wynterian Approach insists on brining into clear focus is what gave Stephen F. Austin the right to have any determination in who could be enslaved given

that he was one who was positioned in his society as always free from being enslaved. This is a sad travesty. The Wynterian Approach offers a way to give voice back to people who were dehumanized, which means having their dignity stolen, and then restore that stolen human dignity to their progeny as must exist in the students of Texas, who need to know that every single person matters.

The intent of the Wynterian Approach is to demonstrate using the concepts of the “sociogenic principle”: which is the idea that meaning for individuals and groups is dependent on the signs and symbols used by the society in which these individuals and groups exist. Given this, Stephen F. Austin is generally presented as a great, flawless, brave, clean and adventurous man who founded Texas. Per the “sociogenic principle” this has become a dominant discourse point of view that can be seen in school curricula and everyday objects deployed in the Texas landscape. The Wynterian Approach seeks to trouble this seemingly sound and utopian iconic construction of Stephen F. Austin by examining him as a historical figure and human man within the milieu of man-made ideas that were popular in his day and measuring those against the question: What does it mean to be human? and What does it mean to support human dignity? who lived at the time he did. By asking these questions the Wynterian Approach attempts to get at not only Stephen F. Austin’s subjective understanding of himself but, also, the subjective understanding of the other humans – Whites, Blacks, and American Indians – who co-existed with him during his lifetime. Finally the Wynterian Approach uses what is a

liminal concept, the Black Studies Perspective (BSP) that specifically seeks to construct and deconstruct the dominant modes of thought concerning how humans fit into the world. This is liminal because the view of other humans whom one is taught to view as different that one's self does shift over time as well as the view of people whom one considers to be just like one's self. The Wynterian Approach calls the dominant outlook, native cultural model (NCM) and the challenge to it, alternative cultural model (ACM). The NCM can sometimes masquerade as an ACM while the ACM rarely ever becomes the NCM. The main purpose of the ACM is to give voice to humans who have been discarded by humans who have been taught to believe that they are the rulers in society of the thoughts others should have about themselves and life opportunities (Wynter 2000; Wynter 1996; Wynter 1992[1990]). The Wynterian Approach seeks to prevent this type of consciousness from going unchallenged wherever it may appear – in official state curricula and state-adopted instructional materials and in seemingly uncontested sites of public memory. But the most salient and powerful tenet of the Wynterian Approach is its insistence on a rejection of cruelty. It is this tenet illustrated most effectively in Wynter's only novel, *The Hill of Hebron* (1962), wherein she consistently through the lived experiences of her characters marks out how intentional cruelty has twisted each of their lives in some way. Without exception, Wynter lets the reader know that all of the characters are human beings who require active positive affirmation of their personal human dignity and collective human dignity. The characters encompass all of the races and racial mixes could be termed creolization or hybridization or pure blooded. The key

point is that all of these “types” are all defiantly human and all have a voice that will be articulated and heard both publically and within the inner self/psychically. Some voices, Wynter writes, are heard publically and projected into almost every space – all Whites and especially White men - because of the intercession of chance called colonization and conquest and inflicting of intentional harm. Wynter continues others – Black men - are heard as authoritative only within a given space. Wynter further continues while others who are told by Whites and Black men to know and keep their place – Black women– develop their voices and articulate it sometimes silently though openly in both safe spaces they have created and in contested spaces only through their consequent and determined actions. Wynter contends have all humans been subjected to the same harmful dominant discourses as well as derivatives of the dominant discourses and so all have been mis-educated but all of those who have been mis-educated did not intentionally try to inflict pain and damage to the human dignity of others because they embraced the practice of human-ness.

In chapter 5, the Wynterian Approach will be theorized and then how it can be effectively used to provide spaces in which all human beings have mutually supported self-worth. In chapter 6, the reader will find a summary of findings interpreted using the Wynterian Approach as a way to advance social studies education.

There are other gaps in the overall scholarship concerning colonization of the Western Hemisphere. Wynter in her book, *Do Not Call Us Negros* (1992[1990]), exposes

an important gap in that is related to Columbus's limited *mentalite* only this gap emerges from Portugal. Columbus sailed for Portugal, which meant he lived within their specific normative cultural knowledge of how the world worked. The Portuguese fail to make a distinction between the Blacks of Angola who are not to be enslaved and Blacks who are designated as trade-fodder. The gap Wynter exposes is a psychological construct that is often neglected in social studies. Fanon, a psychiatrist, in his work *Black Skin, White Mask* (1964) refers to how race is socially constructed. Newsome (2008) calls these socially constructed categories, idealized cognitive models, which support conceptual metaphors and image schema that transform the world from a potential mass of meaningless chaos into a balanced place full of useful meanings. The gap that Wynter exposes is the fact that African people did not universally view one another as being above being enslaved for profit, which is linked to the other outlook that all non-Christians are less than human, did exist in Spain and Portugal, which meant that Columbus was likely well aware of these mutually re-enforcing ways of thinking that shaped his worldview and his subsequent actions. By making this point Wynter is not excusing the social construct that created race-based slavery in the Western Hemisphere. She is illustrating the understanding of how such a harmful idea can be seemingly logically constructed. Yet another supporting example stems from the application of Aristotle's argument, wherein indigenous peoples and African peoples, blacks, are unified into one undifferentiated category of Indios or Negros or slaves (Wynter, 1995).

I do explain the Wynterian Approach below as it pertains to explaining how I used the Wynterian Approach – her method – to systematically exploring already existing normative cultural models – dominant discourses and opens space for the construction of research-based alternative cultural models that will co-exist and challenge normative cultural models. I analyzed what gaps exist in the normative cultural models? I analyzed the overall topic of Texas History at the 4th grade and 7th grade through a focus on the topic of Stephen F. Austin will be chosen for excavation. I examined how the historic figure of Stephen F. Austin is presented in the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills – TEKS – the official state of Texas social studies curriculum in a comparative manner. This manner will examine the similarities and differences between the grade level official curriculum constructions of these social studies figures. The TEKS drives what is put in the officially adopted textbooks at the fourth (4th) grade and seventh (7th) grade levels. I examined how the instructional materials located in the Texas Education Agency State Textbook Archive represents the Texas social studies figure of Stephen F. Austin in a comparative manner between textbooks at the intra-grade level and inter-grade level. I examined how Stephen F. Austin is presented at two sites of public memory – the Bob Bullock Texas State History Museum and the Texas State Cemetery. I examined what native cultural model modes of presentation are made for Texas social studies figure Stephen F. Austin as: 1) hero as pertains to long established dominant narratives/native cultural models and counter-narratives/alternative cultural models or native cultural models; 2) model racial figures within his lifetime in Texas in his dealings with Whites,

Blacks, Native Americans, Mexicans, and women; 3) as a social studies figure who had opportunities to embrace an alternative cultural model that existed during his lifetime – this buttresses the link between subjective understanding, intentional choice, and choosing cruelty. In the end I hope that my findings from my research will assist me in potentially constructing an alternative curriculum that does what Wynter advocates – create a social studies curriculum – TEKS - that embraces the co-existing the frameworks for the Euro-American cultural model and the alternative cultural models that place Texas within a global framework with multiple valid alternative cultural models that all mutually re-enforce the human dignity in all of us by explicitly rejecting the commission of acts of cruelty and choosing explicitly to behave in mutual support of mutual humanity in every single person through creation of safe spaces.

Chapter 5

“Instead those critiques should be seen in their real light as the ongoing emergence of an alternative Utopian discourse, which, even if, sometimes suffering from its own forms of distortion which parallel Ideology, has nevertheless given the “force of possibility” to call for an alternative order sketched out in the I Have a Dream speech of Martin Luther King Jr.” - Sylvia Wynter

How I have used the Wynterian Approach

I used the Wynterian Approach throughout this dissertation study to provide a way to analyze texts in the form of official curricula, state-adopted instructional materials, and sites of public memory for evidence of how Stephen F. Austin is normatively presented to the public. A text is anything that can be read for a specific purpose to make meaning and clarify a general direction. In this fourth chapter the official curricula was the state of Texas official social studies curricula for the fourth (4th) grade and (7th) grade created by the Texas Education Agency (TEA) and approved for use by the elected State Board of Education (SBOE). The state-adopted instructional materials were created to follow the SBOE-sanctioned social studies curriculum for Texas social studies at the fourth and seventh grade levels. At both the fourth (4th) grade and seventh (7th) grade levels, which is Texas social studies three common theme come through after analyzing the instructional materials. The scholar found that the common unifying theme of Stephen F. Austin as Texas icon permeates the curriculum at each grade level before branching off into three specific themes: 1) Stephen F. Austin as

Father of Texas; 2) Stephen F. Austin as Anglo-American Empresario in and of Mexican Texas; 3) Stephen F. Austin as Liberal Populist Statesman. It is these three themes that are analyzed using the Wynterian Approach. The state-adopted instructional materials are the fourth (4th) grade level *Texas Studies Weekly* (2015) published by American Legacy Publishing. For the seventh (7th) grade there are three state-adopted instructional materials: *Texas History* (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt) published by Houghton Mifflin Harcourt (2015); *Texas History* (Mc Graw Hill Education) published by McGraw Hill Education (2015); and *Texas History* (Pearson) published by Pearson Education (2015). The sites of public memory can be divided into two groups linked by the iconography of one historical figure, Stephen F. Austin. One group includes three official sites of public memory that are state-supported institutions: 1) The Texas State Cemetery; 2) The Texas State Capitol; 3) The Bob Bullock Texas State History Museum. The second group includes three general sites of public memory that could easily be overlooked yet serve the purpose of transmitting a steady low-level unchallenged dominant discourse: 1) Stephen F. Austin High School in Austin, Texas; 2) Stephen F. Austin State Park in San Felipe, Texas; 3) Stephen F. Austin State University in Nacogdoches, Texas; and the Stephen F. Austin Status and Visitor's Center in Henry William Munson Park sitting on a lake carved in the shape of Texas in Angleton, Texas.

Summary of Wynterian Approach in Use for Chapter 4

This section will contain a complete demonstration of how the Wynterian Approach can be used to analyze a common narrative of Stephen F. Austin in order to show how the common narrative, a dominant discourse, actually only shows a local culture perspective masquerading as a universal way of knowing. Local cultures are always already limited knowledge to their time of creation, circumstance of creation, and location of creation. A local culture serves the needs of only those who developed the particular culture (Geertz, 1973; Wynter; 2006, 2003 1995, 1992[1990], 1984, 1970). The Stephen F. Austin evaluation will filter through a series of already existing academic canons – history, geography, law, theology – to show how local culture as perpetuated in current textbooks and pedagogical methods will always be lacking and could be so much more. What must be acknowledged before plunging forward is that curricula used in public schools in the US tend to do two things: “1) Reflect a European bias designed to promote self-esteem in Europeans and their descendants; 2) Reflect the willful (intentional) inclusion of false information to encourage [all] students to passively accept their place in society. To challenge this European White Supremacist bias directly often ironically brings charges of being particularist and biased against teaching what is universally good” (Hilliard, 1998).

In chapter 4 of this essay, it was stated that Stephen F. Austin is a Texas icon, who within the officially adopted instructional materials has been traditionally viewed in three ways: 1) the Father of Texas; 2) an Anglo-American Empresario in Mexican Texas; and

3) a Liberal Populist Statesman. This dominant discourse construction is supported in the official Texas State Board of Education (SBOE) approved 4th grade and 7th grade Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS), the official curriculum, that must be taught and that the textbook publishers use as a guide to compose their textbooks and other instructional materials. These positions attributed to Stephen F. Austin in the official instructional will be more fully vetted in this chapter because the curriculum and the instructional materials fail to go into any depth that would be beneficial to developing a really rigorous learning environment to prepare students for a 21st Century world with the 21st century skills (Trilling and Fadel 2012). Adding in-depth research-based connections to other learning is the main way in which the Wynterian Approach is most effective in constructing alternative cultural models with the native cultural model's tools (Wynter, 2000, 1992[1990]).

Rhizomic Linkages to Stephen F. Austin

The instructional materials at both the fourth (4th) grade and seventh (7th) grade levels note that Stephen F. Austin (SFA) lived from 1793 to 1836. Despite the lifespan, the instructional materials fail to historicize SFA at all; moreover the TEKS fail to make any rhizomic linkages that could enhance the depth of study – rigor – of the study of Stephen F. Austin. Rhizomic linkages are derived from the work of Deleuze and Guattari (2001). By using rhizomic linkages Wynter (1995, 1970, 1969, 1968) incorporates the work of undocumented folkways and dances, computer scientists, juridical texts,

religious writings and semiotic philosophers into her work in an attempt to develop narratives that give voice to the full range of humans, especially those who have historically been marginalized, peripheralized and historical erased. This means that Wynter is using the principle of multi-vocality theorized by anthropologist, Victor Turner (1969), which means to allow previously dismissed persons a way to enter in a consequent conversation which then provides them with a subjective place in any human event.

Strictly using Austin's lifetime, one finds that his life overlaps the lives of these White male figures for whom eras have been named – Thomas Jefferson, William Wilberforce, John Marshall, Andrew Jackson, John C. Calhoun, and Abraham Lincoln. Another way of stating this would be the Age of Jefferson to the Age of Jackson finishing with Abraham Lincoln. The ideas put forth by these White American men overlapped and re-enforced one another in that their ideas all articulated an interlocking belief in the absolute superiority of Whites over all non-Whites – this was the zeitgeist of the time in the United States (Finkelman 2003; Joshi 1999). Other contemporaries who would not be overtly coupled to Stephen F. Austin as influential historical contemporaries as they are non-White are: Nat Turner, Sojourner Truth, Frederick Douglass, Antonio Lopez de Santa Anna, Sequoyah, Lorenzo de Zavala, Erasmo Seguin. The point here is to situate SFA among a milieu of people, events, and ideas that were flourishing in the world in which SFA lived and with whom SFA could reasonably have been aware as he was a

White male literate college-educated lawyer, which was an extreme rarity at the time he lived. On the other hand, this issue of SFA's awareness becomes complicated with the Wynterian Approach tenet – rejection of cruelty – because this very tenet would mean that SFA would have had to make the effort to view Blacks and Native Americans as being humans like himself. Rejection of cruelty is determined through the evaluation of the definitely unnecessary unneeded intentional actions that are cruel (sociopathic or psychopathic) – utterances and behaviors – that show when filtered through the social studies disciplines of anthropology, economics, geography, history, political science, psychology, sociology that choices were made that would result in known definite harm to a group of people resulting in some sort of material deprivation vital to existence or cause psychological harm. Rejection of cruelty, if unintentional the outcome of cruel dysconscious acts definitely placed another group in a harmful situation that was likely observable (e.g. enslavement, forced labor, lack of clothing, lack of food, subject to forced sex, forced to watch loved ones being tortured or sold off to places unknown, begging for basic kindness). We know that SFA was slaveowner – an intentional violator of human dignity - and led militia to remove encroaching Native Americans from the land he was granted by Mexico – Indian removal was a policy of intentional genocide by the US government pursued by President Andrew Jackson in the 1830's. It is these contemporary ideas against which I will evaluate SFA. Each of SFA's representations - Father of Texas, Empresario, and Liberal Populist Statesman - carry with them certain ideas that would have necessarily placed him in proximity to new ideas such as westward

expansion, free soil makes free men, abolition of slavery, women's rights, liberal economics, federalism Indian removal, and expanded common man democracy, the place of free Blacks in a free White society and constitutional law.

The Age of Jefferson – 1800 to 1820 - encompasses the life and writings of Thomas Jefferson along with the territorial expansion of the United States, foreign relations with Spain and France, and the undying question of the place of slavery in a democracy with a foundation ideal that all humans are equal. Stephen F. Austin was born into a wealthy propertied family. Early on he became a citizen of Spain in North America due to his father, Moses Austin, a Connecticut Yankee via Virginia social-climber, being granted control of lead mines in Spanish Louisiana territory, Missouri, by the Spanish government. Jefferson's writings on government, law, race and religion were popular readings in colleges across the US, and definitely in Kentucky where SFA was educated to be a lawyer. Jefferson (Finkelman 2003; Joshi 1999) in his *Notes on the State of Virginia* (1781) opines that from his observations Negroes are inferior to Whites in every way and that he cannot imagine integrating them into US society as the social equals of Whites because Blacks will always remember how they were intentionally mistreated and abused as human property – slaves – and, so, will always be looking for a way to kill Whites; Whites cannot be expected to live in fear with such a morally correct constant reminder of their individual and collective guilt towards these human beings. Jefferson

omits that he had illicit sexual assaultive relations with a teen-aged slave who was the half-sister of his wife.

To invigorate the study of Stephen F. Austin these competing ideas ought to be forthrightly studied. All of these ideas that these men represent fall within the dominant discourse or native cultural model (NCM) that Wynter put forth. The Age of Jackson (1815 to 1850) and the writings of John C. Calhoun (1815 to 1850) as well as the US Supreme Court decisions of the Marshall Court (1801 to 1835) all overlap. Andrew Jackson ushered in the era of the common man, which really meant that formerly disenfranchised White males due to having too little property to qualify to vote saw themselves enfranchised because property qualifications were legislated away. These were simple White men who were overwhelmingly illiterate and viewed any non-White as a threat to the exercise of his constitutional right to own property. Jackson supported them because he advocated the opening of the formerly Indian lands to white settlement and the removal of the Indians to west of the Mississippi. Jackson supported the Indian Removal Act of 1831. John C. Calhoun (1837) advocated the positive good of slavery as well as the fact that he viewed any attack on slavery as an attack on constitutional freedom to own property, which in his mind gave all slaveholding states the right to secede. Jackson disagreed vehemently with Calhoun's nullification idea that would give states the right to veto any federal law or any part of any federal law that the state believed violated its constitutionally guaranteed states' rights. John Marshall developed

the doctrine of “domestic dependent nations” in the Georgia Cherokee US Supreme Court cases of the 1830’s. These cases placed the American Indians in a position that their land rights were never ever guaranteed in perpetuity because the United States could assert its dominant claim to sovereignty over the same Indian-nation claimed land at any time (Finkelman 2003; Joshi 1999). How do Stephen F. Austin’s ideas fit in with these men in terms of his ideas concerning the place of non-Whites in his Mexican Texas colony and later in an independent Republic of Texas? How would Wynter go about connecting the aforementioned ideas, which are NCM stated above and still provide a counter-argument, ACM? Note that the actions chosen and enacted by Jackson, Calhoun, Marshall and Austin show an enactment of cruelty. The choices these men made did not need to be made and the fact that they were made meant that these men chose to subject a given group of people to harm through deprivation of items necessary for sustaining life and by exposing them to conditions that had a high likelihood of resulting in a disproportionate amount of deaths. We know this because there were people who lived at the same time who did not believe what these men did and chose to act differently. They were Whites who acted out of Christian faith for abolitionism, American Indian rights, women’s rights, constitutional rights for all. Usually they were tagged as troublemakers by those who fervently or silently supported the native cultural model that resulted in the dehumanization of all humans save for White men.

Abolition of slavery for Black Americans, women's rights, liberal economics, federalism, Indian removal, Manifest Destiny, expanded common White man democracy, the place of free Blacks in a free White society and constitutional law all fall within the social studies disciplines. These inter-related ideas all occur during the lifetime time of Stephen F. Austin yet they are not all addressed in the fourth (4th) grade and seventh (7th) grade Texas social studies TEKS. This means that the claim made in the TEKS to be comprehensive is false. Remember that the Wynterian Approach always means that the scholar will cast her/his net wide to evaluate as many plausibly related ideas as possible to construct a more complete argument than before. With Wynter, also, the work of analysis and constructing arguments and re-constructing arguments is never done because there is always new research and new ways of thinking that enter the picture (McKittrick, 2015; Wynter, 2006, 2000, 1992[1990]).

Abolition refers to a movement that began at the outset of this nation. Using the work of legal scholar, A. Leon Higginbotham (1978) one finds that in the English colonies whether north or south of the Mason-Dixon Line that masters had constant fear that white, black, and Indian indentured servants would band together to strike down their masters. Moreover, Higginbotham finds that in the 1640's that all Blacks were not servants. What Higginbotham does find is that a steady "debasement" of Blacks was afoot and he proves it in a case of a white indentured servant who disobeyed her black overseer yet was not punished because the overseer was black. Also, Higginbotham finds

that in Massachusetts a black code was passed because free blacks and black servants were viewed especially being a nuisance despite only constituting about 8% of the population. Wynter (2006, 2000, 1992[1990]) would argue that the Blacks as early as this time were being othered and made into monstrosities to justify tougher punishments being pronounced upon them in order to protect White society from their pollution. Higginbotham (1978) then compares what happens in Massachusetts with what happens in colonial Virginia. In colonial Virginia Black indentured servants, who rebelled, even with White indentured servants, were compelled to be forced to be indentured servants in perpetuity while the Whites only received an extension of several years. The key point here is that Higginbotham uncovers that Virginia law imposed a harsher penalty on Blacks due to “their woolier hair, their flatter noses, [and] their darker skin – thus the deprivations that even “aliens” were never subjected to, if they were white (pg.60).”

Given the argument that Higginbotham (1978) constructs to show how Blacks were made alien in the British North American colonies, the problem now is to deepen the argument here to show an alternative cultural model beginning of the arguments for and against slavery of non-Whites in colonies. Wynter would go to the logical place of Columbus. It is here she would discover that Columbus’ contemporary, Bartolome de Las Casas (1484-1566), provides an example of the beginning of an abolitionist movement before the term was even known to the world. De Las Casas (1999 [1552]) is responsible for the book, *A Short History of the Destruction of the Indies*, which gives an

impassioned insider-observer account of the decimation of the Taino peoples who had had the misfortune of coming under Spain's rule via Columbus' accidental voyage. De Las Casas became the Spanish royal official protector of the Indios by pushing for the end of *encomiendas* and later he became convinced that the enslavement of Africans was a sin after he had staunchly worked to have as Indios removed from *encomiendas* to have them replaced by African slaves. How does this connect to Stephen F. Austin?

Stephen F. Austin as Father of Texas encompasses a range of possibilities – of connections. As the “Father of Texas” he was considered a protector of his people. Who, then, were Stephen F. Austin's people? In general his people were white settlers who were seeking cheap land upon which to build a new life. These white settlers were willing to enter a foreign nation, Mexico, for the promise of cheap fertile land which was better than any deal in the United States. Not only that but SFA encouraged the bringing of slaves, all of whom were Blacks who had been systematically dehumanized through the constant daily terror of being beaten by their owners, assaulted by their owners, and forced to work for the benefit of their owners. These were violations of human rights.

What you read before this section, Wynterian Approach in Use, was a rhizomic theorization of the Wynterian Approach to appraise the reader of the vast potential that exists. What will follow is first the presentation of the chapter material that culled the instructional materials for proof of the themes. For each theme the fourth (4th) grade and

seventh (7th) grade section will be analyzed together using the Wynterian Approach because the TEKS repeat for both of these grade levels of Texas History & Geography.

Wynterian Approach Applied to Stephen F. Austin as Father of Texas

A Wynterian Approach would first examine the idea of father in both United States' culture of the 1800's. The best example of the "father figure" would be Moses Austin, Stephen F. Austin's father. Moses Austin embodied the "yankee ingenuity" that reputedly made America great. Moses Austin had married into a wealthy Virginia merchant family. From there he took his wife's inheritance and invested it in a lead mine contract in Missouri, which at that time was part of New Spain. Moses Austin sent his son, Stephen, off to boarding school in Connecticut and then only wrote his son letters that admonished him "to be studious...and to strive for greatness...as your Dear Mother and Sister and little Brother will look to you for protection (Cantrell, 1999, p. 25). Part of Stephen's training was to learn to endure long separations from family and to still remain focused on the main task at hand – making money. Moses Austin was an independent thinker and did not belong to any organized church. This fact is important because Stephen wrote a letter to his mother when he was an empresario in Mexican Texas asking what religion he had been baptized and she replied "by a protestant Clerjyman (Cantrell, 1999, pg. 23).

Moses Austin made the trip to Spanish Missouri by himself to inquire about obtaining the possibility of obtaining a lead mine contract and several leagues of land.

Note that this was the same type of deal he floated to the Mexican authorities in Texas when he wanted to gain permission for his settlement of 300 American Catholic families in Texas. Moses Austin did continue to establish the foundation upon which a successful enterprise could be established, which he did twice and both times by choosing to leave United States territory for Spanish territory, which showed early on the global reach of capitalism. Wynter (2006) could argue that Moses Austin presents an example of “ethno-astronomy” wherein he was able to understand that the “space of otherness” he freely had chosen to enter was one where the foundational principles matched his beliefs because he, himself, did not believe himself to be fundamentally alienated from the chief land claimants, the Spanish, by race or religion and so Moses could believe that he was obtaining a fair opportunity. However, Richmond was considered to be different – a human other - from him in terms of humanity and social existence save for what services he was required to perform as “travel companion.” Here is an example of contrast in othernesses living in spaces of otherness yet separated by a false construct – race – yet united in the fact that both were – US citizens.

What is bothersome in the treatment of Moses Austin is that the only instance of Moses Austin’s attitudes toward Blacks comes to us from the fact that when he visited his son, Stephen, in Arkansas on the way to present his scheme for a white settler colony in Texas that Moses borrowed Richmond, his son’s Black slave as a travel companion (Cantrell, 1999, pg. 77). How could we get at Richmond’s thoughts about his

enslavement? One way to approximate the thoughts of Richmond would be to examine the thoughts of one of his contemporaries, Nat Turner (1801 – 1831), who led the rebellion of enslaved Blacks that resulted in the killing of many of their White owners. In *The Confessions of Nat Turner* a point that Turner makes is that he and his fellow slaves viewed their masters as uncompromising torturers and agents of evil who did not follow the very Christian principles that they insisted that their Black slaves observe by faithfully serving their owners/masters (Styron, 1992). Not only is there Nat Turner to consider but one could use the seminal work of Carter G. Woodson (1922), *The Negro in Our History*, to note that under “slave insurrections” he states that Negroes endeavored to secure relief [from enslavement] by refreshing the tree of liberty with the blood of their oppressors” (pg. 92). This observation gives way to the fact of the successful Black slave revolt in the independent Black Republic of Haiti in 1804, which had been the very profitable French sugar colony of Saint Domingue in the Caribbean and the planned but suppressed Black insurrections of Gabriel Prosser in 1800 and Denmark Vesey in 1822. Together these demonstrate that some enslaved Blacks did have an independent subjective understanding about their brutal conditions of existence. Wynter (1992[1990]) would argue that these revolts of Black slaves against their state of subjugation, marginalization and social erasure demonstrate that, although the Blacks had been pummeled daily with reminders that the native cultural model (NCM) stated that they did not matter, that the Blacks still had the collective self-pride forge an alternative cultural

model (ACM) rooted in what Hilliard (1998) termed a collective mutual dependence that allowed them to act with essential unity despite high levels of contingency.

What should be noted here is that this addition to the Stephen F. Austin as Father of Texas story comes from sources that are considered traditional and researched well within the social studies canon or native cultural model (NCM) as the source is a book by a Texas History professor. In the biography of Stephen F. Austin there are no radical flows of information that divest Stephen F. Austin of his dominant discourse inspired iconography as Father of Texas. However, it must be noted equally that the alternative cultural model themes used the methods of research approved within the traditional NCM social studies canon. This Father of Texas theme links with the last two themes as the idea of father as protector gets folded into the next two themes of him as Empresario and as Liberal Populist Statesman. The Wynterian Approach to analyzing Stephen F. Austin as Anglo-American Empresario in and of Mexican Texas will follow the recapitulation of the instructional material findings that support this theme at the fourth (4th) grade and seventh (7th) grade levels.

Wynterian Approach Applied to Stephen F. Austin as Anglo-American Empresario

The role of empresario was a legal and political one that left Stephen F. Austin always trying to follow his father's Moses advice by showing how he could helpful and come to be seen as indispensable. Was Stephen F. Austin the dependable Anglo-American in Mexican Texas? What is linked to this position of empresario, which is a

legal position in Mexican law? Does the opportunity open for comparative work based on what the analytical findings of the Wynterian Approach?

According to the state adopted and state approved by the Texas Education Agency instructional materials for the fourth and seventh grade levels the following events happened to Moses Austin which put Stephen F. Austin (SFA) in charge. Upon receiving the landgrant in January 1821 from the Kingdom of Spain through the government of the Viceroyalty of New Spain meeting in the city of Monterrey – Spain’s colonial government that encompassed Texas - Moses Austin died in 1821. This left his son, Stephen F. Austin in charge. Upon SFA’s taking over, a change of government occurred creating a Constitutional Empire of Mexico because Mexico had successfully concluded its war of independence with Spain in 1821. Governor Antonio Martinez, a *peninsulare*, and the last Spanish governor of Texas, advised SFA to travel to Mexico City to lobby the new imperial government on his own behalf to approve his landgrant. In April 1822, SFA made a 1000 mile journey by horseback to Mexico City. SFA arrived and had to wait to see various government officials as well as scheme on how to meet government officials all while teaching himself to be literate in Spanish so that he could converse and write both legal and social documents. The problem was that the place was in some chaos as Iturbide, a *criollo*, was declared Constitutional Emperor of Mexico but soon he was overthrown by a liberal economic government that believed that Mexico should be modelled along the lines of a federal republic as in the United States. What is worth

noting is that Iturbide's government did pass the *Imperial Colonization Law* in January 1823, which confirmed SFA's landgrant in April 1823 and the terms were law. It was this Imperial Colonization Law that created the position of Empresario of which SFA was the only person to ever benefit from the very generous terms of this law as it was nullified in August 1824 because Emperor Iturbide has been overthrown back in 1823. Soon after a *National Colonization Law* was passed in August 1824 followed by the *Coahuila y Tejas State Colonization Law of 1825* (Calvert, De Leon & Cantrell, 2007; Wallace, Vignes, Ward, 2002, p. 46 – 50).

This rich exchange of law and social position in Mexico and, by extension, in Mexican Texas needs to be studied. Alas, it is not in the TEKS for either grade. If one notes above that Antonio Martinez was designated as a *peninsulare* while Emperor Iturbide was designated as a *criollo* then one must ask what do these designations mean? Are these designations cultural products of Spain implanted upon its North American colony and by extension other colonies? Are there any similarities between these designations and anything in the United States in law or by custom?

Spain imported a social system into Mexico called the Casta System. The purpose of the Casta System was to determine how far the *limpieza de sangre*/blood purity and racial make-up of a resident of the Spain's colonies were from the perceived perfection of that of an Iberian-born Spaniard. Immediately what is noted here is the othering of humans in order to select them out from any perceived place of honor and privilege. The

Casta System classified residents of New Spain, the Spanish North American colony that included present-day Mexico and Texas in a combination social racial political and economic hierarchy that was rooted in the ending of the almost 800-year Reconquista that had gone on between the warring armies of the religions of Islam in the Caliphate of Granada versus the Roman Catholic Church in the combined armies of the Kingdom of Castile and the Kingdom of Aragon. In the book *Genealogical Fictions*, Martinez (2008) suggests that *limpieza de sangre* was part of an important plan to segment Christian society in true believers and suspect converts to Roman Catholicism from Judaism and Islam. Families, therefore, kept supposedly well-researched family genealogies as well as well-maintained family histories of marriages, births, and deaths and property as it changed hands often in wars across religious categories as the situation could at times be fluid. Carrera (2003) in *Imagining Identity in New Spain* and Martinez (2008) concur that the ranks in the Casta System were as follows. The top tier or first rank were the *Peninsulares* – always considered blanca/White - a pure blood Spaniard with two Spanish parents born in Spain on the Iberian Peninsula. This group of people had exclusive access to any of the top offices in the royal civil bureaucracy, the royal army and royal navy and the Roman Catholic Church bureaucracy. All of this came to them due to an accident of geography. The downside of this was that it had the effect of elevating men who would be considered mere commoners and low aristocracy in Spain to respected “Dons” or “Lord/Sir” in the colonies. In other words the prestige of being a *peninsulare* did not

necessarily transfer back to the home country of Spain because origins of family did still matter there much more than in the colonies.

At the second rank were the *Criollos* – always considered blanca/White but always tainted by place of birth - these were pure blood Spaniards who suffered the misfortune of having been born in the colony. The accident of geography permanently barred them from all top royal positions and Roman Catholic Church positions. The tension between *peninsulare* and *criollo* was always palpable and increased with time until the “revolution” in 1821 when the *criollos* took over and banished the *peninsulares* from Mexico. Like the revolution in the USA the revolution in Mexico did the same thing: the top tier of colonial people in wealth and education and opportunity replaced the top tier of home country people who had been imported to govern and maintain order (Martinez 2008; Carrera 2003).

In the third rank were the *Mestizos*, who had one Spanish parent and one Indio parent. They were limited in their life chances but at least had access to the lower ranks of the royal bureaucracies and the Roman Catholic Church. They could own businesses and engage in business with their social betters (Martinez 2008; Carrera 2003) .

In the fourth rank were the *Mulattos*, who had one Spanish parent and one Negro parent. They were even more limited in life chances but at least could run a business and transact business with their social betters. By special permission they were permitted to enter the lower ranks of the royal bureaucracies and the Roman Catholic Church. This

means if they lived in a less populated place they likely would have better life chances than in a large urban environment, because their lack of position could be overlooked if it filled a genuine public need (Martinez 2008; Carrera 2003).

At the bottom were the pure-blooded *Indios* indigenous to the region, and pure-blooded *Negros* involuntarily transplanted from Africa, who were considered to be at the opposite end of civilization because they were dark-skinned. They were expected to do the most degraded work of cleaning of any kind and preparing meals and looking after the children of all of their social betters. They could be beaten at any time for any reason by their social betters (Martinez 2008; Carrera 2003). Remember the ultimate irony is that the *Indios* and *Negros* were the only others who could rightfully claim true *limpieza de sangre* but were intentionally barred from attributing this “honor” to themselves by the Spaniards. The intention of the *Casta System* was to measure the person’s distance from Whiteness or purity and being human. Given this mixes of *Indios* and *Negros* were usually designated with ranks named after animals.

All of the lower ranks were obsessed with marrying up to improve themselves That means making their families closer to the preached dominant discourse cultural ideal, closeness to *blanca*/white in skintone/pigment. Also, certificates granting official reclassification to another social rank could be obtained if a person gained sufficient wealth and the social respect of his/her betters who were then expected to testify before a committee of churchmen and royal officials about the “obvious mistake” that had been

made some years ago resulting in a horrid though understandable mistake of misclassification by a priest in the church registry of births (Burkholder 2015; Carrera 2003; Martinez 2008.)

Stephen F. Austin had to enter the social classification logic of this world of Mexico. In this case he had to learn the dominant language in order to engage in the dominant discourse that was crucial to the politics of that time and place. This was a case where the West was Spain and the Spanish-derived culture of Mexico. SFA had to become inundated in it in order to survive with the fact of his whiteness opening the doors to the powerful. His willingness to become literate in Spanish language and socio-political etiquette helped him cement access to the highest circles of central government then federal government in Mexico City and his home government of *Coahila y Tejas*. SFA learned how the knowledge he needed in that time and space was organized and he went about mastering it (Shohat & Sham 1994, pgs. 13-15).

Stephen F. Austin's official role as empresario meant that he had the role of absolute lawmaker and lawgiver and military leader in his colony. In carrying out these roles SFA chose to rely on the system that he had been educated in as a lawyer, US constitutional law. Given his orientation toward US legal doctrine Austin organized his colony as democratically as possible. He established laws but he recognized that he had to find men he could trust. Here SFA never considered appointing any non-White men because as one could see with the fact of his ownership of the Black American,

Richmond, he did not consider Blacks to be capable of anything other than servitude, which made him less than human as it meant he was a natural slave. Richmond represents the fact that SFA engaged in racialized terror and did not see fit to change. An interesting twist on Native Cultural Model as Alternative Cultural Model occurs here as SFA had to embrace two competing yet complimentary forms of NCM in that while SFA seems to be opposed to the enslavement of Black humans as propounded in Mexican law he still finds Mexico's law to be more enlightened (Cantrell 1999) but he did not believe that he could attract sufficient white Anglo-American settlers to settle in his colony without allowing for slavery or devising ways for his settlers to get around the anti-slavery laws of Mexico which is both NCM and ACM (Wynter 1992[1990]). Effectively Cantrell (1999) avers that SFA was bothered by the enslavement of Black humans but never so bothered as to want to ban it from his colony like Thomas Jefferson. In fact SFA was so unbothered by the enslavement – the intentional racial terrorization (Shohat & Sham 1994, pg. 78) – of Blacks that he lobbied the Central government of Mexico in Mexico City and the state government of *Coahuila y Tejas* to exempt Texas and his colony in particular from absolute enforcement of Mexico's abolition of slavery. Consequently, there is no strong abolition movement that appears in Texas because of the collusion of Stephen F. Austin with varying Mexican government officials who viewed slavery as a matter of liberal economic advancement of Texas. Stephen F. Austin acted very much as Thomas Jefferson did in his purported discomfort with the enslavement of Blacks yet Jefferson managed to enslave over 100 Black humans.

The carry-over from Stephen F. Austin's iconic theme of an *Empresario* will meld well with his third iconic them of Liberal Populist Statesman. First you will read a recapitulation of the third section of chapter 4 followed by the Wynterian Approach analysis.

Wynterian Approach Applied to Stephen F. Austin as Liberal Populist Statesman

What is meant by liberal populist statesman as an iconographic theme? Liberal encompasses the following individuals – Du Bois, Woodson, Fanon, James, Wynter as they are philosophical liberals about opening all of any society's opportunities to those who have a desire to use them effectively to add value and build a more inclusive world where all people actively support the human dignity of others. Their scholarship is designed to open up opportunities for intentionally historically marginalized individuals to become empowered by registering a subjective existence through their narratives. These liberal scholars seek through effective praxis to allow teachers and students, usually of color, who have been pushed to margins to develop a praxis of human dignity that creates a unifying transformative language that articulates the differences of their lived experiences as they as individuals and groups use the dominant discourses of US society and global society to expose the perniciously subtractive everyday habits of deploying demeaning practices and demeaning language to institute the social death through a process that develops self-hatred. Their works seek to advance a transformative narrative that insists that Whites examine their daily practices among themselves and

their interactions with non-White humans so that they can themselves become more human (Mc Kittrick, 2014; De Lissevoy and Brown, 2013; Losurdo, 2011; Wynter, 1995).

In addition, Thomas Jefferson, John C. Calhoun, Andrew Jackson, and Stephen F. Austin along with Lorenzo de Zavala and Juan Seguin, because they were expressly economic liberals who in the 1800's supported a liberal federal republican government, limited government regulation without government interference concerning how a property-owner may use his property, and gain unfettered access to economic progress. This second set of liberals – the economic liberals - did not support the universal freedom of all men on the basis of equal constitutional citizenship before the law as they supported the enslavement of humans of African descent/ Black humans and the expropriation of land by force from Native Americans as they were viewed as barriers to economic progress. What Wynter would see here is a paradox much as the same as the paradox that embraced Columbus and many other human-made situations in these questions– How can one avoid doing bad while doing good? How is good defined in a given situation? Is there an absolute concept of good that we universally apply to every situation?

These opposed set of liberals represent the problem of the NCM and the ACM emerging in most cases from overlapping and similar dominant discourses. As a liberal Stephen F. Austin's primary goal was to set the stage for the dynamic and unfettered

growth of his colony. His quest for success is related to a legal tradition that goes back to the priest Sepulveda, who argued in the 1500's before Isabella and Ferdinand as he was the Royal Historian, that the Indios whom the Spanish encountered and slaughtered were justifiably slaughtered in a "just war" because they had resisted by force of arms the idea of the True Faith and the lordship of Queen Isabella of Castile and King Ferdinand of Aragon. Given this the Indios were not real humans but rather savage versions of what would be humans. Also, even if offered the opportunity to accept the True Faith it would be generations before they would be fit for civilization. This train of thought became the dominant train of thought that guided Spain's conquistadors, Roman Catholic Church officials, royal officials, merchants, military men, and settlers (Dussell, 2013). Stephen F. Austin, as a quasi-official member of Mexican government, given his powers received as an Empresario under the Imperial Colonization Law embraced this thinking when he dealt with the Indians upon whose land he was squatting. Invariably this idea of a "just war" was the justification that Austin sought. For example during the Fredonian conflict with rogue empresario Haden Edwards, Stephen F. Austin, as a colonel in the Mexican army used Edwards alliance with the Cherokee as evidence to rally his colonists against both Edwards and the Cherokee which resulted in the gaining of large amounts of additional land through confiscation (Dussell, 2013; Cantrell, 1999; Campbell, 1991).

Liberalism always had a healthy interventionist component. In this case the interventionism is populism in that the majority of the white settler population supported

the action against a fellow white settler, Haden Edwards, as a necessary evil, despite the fact that the action fortified the power of the government of Mexico in 1829. What other items would Mexico find abhorrent about its Anglo-American settlers in Tejas? After the Edwards fiasco, General Manuel Mier y Teran was sent to do an inspection of Tejas to determine what the true problems were. The general found that the English-speaking Anglo-American settlers outnumbered the Spanish-speaking Mexican citizens by a factor of 10 to 1. To compound the problem the general found that the Anglo-American settlers were not honoring the pledges they had made to the government of Mexico in order to receive a chunk of cheap land that was tax deferred and tithe-deferred. The pledges that had been made by the Anglo-American settlers was to 1) convert to Roman Catholicism and 2) learn Spanish and 3) obey Mexico's laws. According to Wynter this is an perfect example of using the NCM to show how the NCM was intentionally violated. The point is there is a counter-NCM to the Teran inspection report. According to De Leon (1983), the Anglo-American settlers viewed the Mexican citizens who were already there as "degenerate creatures who were un-Christian, uncivilized, and racially impure (pg. 101)."

What do these terms mean? Here is where the Wynterean continues to leave no stone unturned while the official TEKS and the officially adopted instructional materials do not even bother. The terms of debate used to demean the Mexican Texans/Tejanos must be clarified. Un-Christian to the Anglo-American settlers meant non-Protestant as most were not Roman Catholic and viewed Catholicism as a religion that was close to

devil worship as it had people praying to saints who were not Jesus Christ. Uncivilized folds into the racially impure because many of the Tejanos were Mestizos – they had a mixed racial and cultural heritage of being part Indio and part Spanish and in some cases part Indio, part Spanish and part Negro. To the Anglo-American settlers who thought of themselves as comparatively racially pure this made the Tejanos into yet another species of human others, who could be disposed of without much thought. This Anglo-American settler view of Tejanos was also populist because it could support a transfer of more cheap land through confiscation and just war to allow more deserving, Christian, and civilized Anglo-American settlers more opportunities for unlimited economic growth (Cantrell 1999; Campbell 1991).

To go further the implications of this liberalism cum populism creates a situation for the emergence of a statesman who embraces a White Supremacist ideology without having to give much thought to any non-Whites. Moreover, this statesman, Stephen F. Austin, found himself through his embrace of liberalism and populism in a political position to reasonably argue to his supporters that promises they made to me that I solemnly made to you as the reason they came to Mexican Texas to settle. SFA did have another card to play by happenstance, because he had been to Mexico City in 1832 to meet with Mexican officials to present the demands of the Consultation of 1833 wherein the Anglo-American settlers had demanded local self-government and the right of Tejas to exist as an independent state within Mexico, the use of English as the official language

of business, and the right to engage in trade with the United States, and the right to trial by jury as in the USA. The key point is that President of Mexico Santa Anna had agreed to all of the demands except for Tejas becoming an independent state in Mexico. SFA had left Mexico City but he had sent a letter stating that he believed that the Anglo-American settlers should prepare to become an independent state. The question is whether SFA meant within Mexico or within the United States or as an independent republic. SFA's letter was intercepted and he was arrested though never charged and detained for a year in Mexico City. It was not until 1835 that he was released and he made the 1000 mile journey back to Texas convinced that Texas must be an independent nation (Cantrell, 1999; Campbell, 1991). Now SFA had moved through the phases of being viewed by Mexico as their dependable Anglo-American *Empresario* who was always willing to compromise to the economic liberal who wanted to see Texas transformed into a cotton producer with a large enslaved and intentionally tortured on a daily basis Black human population. It was this last position as a pro-slavery liberal that cemented SFA's reputation as a man of the people – to be precise a man of the White people. Using Wynter (1995, 1994, 1992[1990]) allows for the complexity of these arguments to be made within the realm of native cultural models and alternative cultural models but, moreover, Wynter allows for the consideration of nuances within native cultural models masquerading as alternate cultural models when this is clearly not the case.

Summary of How Wynter Uses Her Approach

Sylvia Wynter developed a scholarly approach that begins by developing her local mind – her personal *mentalite* which emerges from how she understands herself in terms of contingency to be situated in the world as a human being. Wynter establishes the heart of the Wynterian Approach by establishing her personal understanding as being linked to the local culture (Geertz, 1973) which she calls an alternative cultural model (Wynter, 1992[1990]) suffused with human dignity from her particular personal perspective.

Wynter's research rooted in both her actually experienced direct-lived experience in the concrete sociogeny combined and merged with the indirect researched formal education experience with its own sociogeny. These convergent realities that shaped her Self, her ontology, her beingness-in-the-world, were viewed by her as fully human and full of human dignity that no one other human or group of humans had any universal natural right from which to her deprive and exclude her and the others who were simultaneously living their particular culture along with her and for that matter any other human or group of humans living within the boundaried realities of any other culture. A key point here is that the culture into which Wynter was born simultaneously situated and positioned her in these multiple identities: a Black, a human of African descent, a member of the African Diaspora, an Afro-Caribbean, a woman, a Black woman, a sexual human being, an English speaker, a colonial British subject living in a colony as part of intentionally peripheralized group or intentionally historically marginalized groups (IHMG). This is

pure Lacan (1970) in that Wynter was first known by multiple (m)others of received Eurocentric White British culture BEFORE she was able to be fully cognizant of the hybridized living circumstances in which she and fellow similarly situated humans would involuntarily be engulfed and have to discover. Fanon (1952) stated this same point before Lacan in *Black Skin White Masks* with respect to how Blacks in the Caribbean come to know themselves as always already socialized beings thoroughly immersed in French culture, a White European culture, as the only culture that matters as it is the only culture that carries social cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1992) in a predominantly African Diaspora Black society. C.L.R. James (2016), another influential Black Caribbean scholar, in *American Civilization*, concurs when he states that the use of the Word is a powerful tool that must be used to shape learners to go forth without fear to develop their abilities to use the Word to both criticize deficiencies in use that attempt to intentionally discourage some while developing new paths for those who would normally be discouraged to be encouraged to take up the study of Word for positive growth.

The Wynterian Approach attacks the historically intentionally marginalized status of *selekted-in* groups (*selekted-in* is a neologism I created derived from the German Nazi term, *Selektion*, which means to be chosen to be exterminated or used as slave labor). The *selektion* process occurred because of dominant discourses rooted in local cultures that had been arrogantly and falsely enlarged and imposed upon other human who had no familiarity with that local culture. The imposition of the falsely enlarged

culture meant that the humans upon whom this alien culture was imposed were brought into, albeit involuntarily, the logic, language and semiotics of that imposed culture. Here is crux of the Wynterian Approach. Wynter set about exposing the harm of the dominant discourse/imposed local culture now a falsely enlarged universal culture by turning the histories of the dominant culture back upon itself to expose its actually limited worldview. To do this Wynter (2000) employed the works and concepts of three IHMG African Diaspora Black male scholars, Carter G. Woodson's (1933) "mis-education theory" and Frantz Fanon's (1952) "sociogeny" along with W.E.B Du Bois' "double consciousness", to help her build her arguments. The works of these three men worked well for her because they had experienced the double exposure of living as a vilified member of a core society while still experiencing the warm embrace of partial acceptance after excelling academically up the meritocratic ranks by earning doctorates in their respective fields. The doctorate signified to all in both White societies and Black societies that they had not only learned but mastered the breadth and depth of the academic canon, which overflowed with lessons of intentional mis-education that sent them a message that they were "lacking" in stature and should hate themselves, because they were the offspring of Africans who were "savages." What Woodson, Du Bois, Fanon and later Wynter did instead, was choose to persist in their research to better understand how the world worked according to what Wynter (1992[1990]) would call, the native cultural model (NCM), which embraced the totality of Western European White Supremacist/Anglo-American White Supremacist dominant discourses of colonialism,

the casta system, the plantation system, segregation, and the prison pipeline perpetual poverty cycle reserved disproportionately for people of African descent, dark-skinned Latinos, and Native Americans. After mastering this unholy potentially psychological toxic pot of stew they chose to analyze dominant discourses through the perspectives of those who were condemned to the margins by the dominant discourses, which Wynter termed the alternative cultural model (ACM). In the Wynterian Approach the IHMGs are always already pre-determined by the dominant discourse/imposed local culture as already marginalized, erased and/or silenced. These terms imply to remove from being human and are associated with the work of Joyce E. King's (1991) concept of "dysconscious racism" merged with Fanon's (1952) call that a human's ontology or Being is shaped by the societies in which one has most of her/his encounters. To be silenced is associated with robbing and belittling humans, in groups and as individuals, to point where they/he/she devalue themselves and their very utterances, which is associated with anthropologist Victor Turner's (1969) concept of "multivocality," which means to assert that so-called "primitive" humans have many ways of speaking that do not necessarily fit the dominant discourse definitions of true human communication but have value. The ACM was designed to prevent marginalization, erasure, and silencing or put another way, education ought to include "a [good faith] commitment to political and educational emancipation to create a transformative anti-racist" space of growth where participants can feel safe and encouraged to develop their confidence by displaying

competence in their purposeful learning to add value to the world in terms of social justice (De Lissevoy and Brown, 2013; Collins, 1990).

The ACM is the tool to be used to combat being harmed through marginalization, erasure and silencing. Wynter's (Wynter, 1992[1990]) Black Studies Perspective (BSP) is an example of an ACM as it is a tool of defense of human dignity as it states the point of view of someone who has usually been intentionally ignored. The ACM contains the following concepts: 1) sociogenic principle; 2) subjective understanding; 3) liminality and 4) rejection of cruelty. These open a space wherein mutual human dignity of all people can be mutually recognized and defended at the cost of the Praxis of being Human (Wynter, 2001). The problem with the imposed local culture, a native cultural model, is that as the dominant discourse that developed to defend all actions taken in the name of the native cultural model/dominance discourse/hegemonic culture were meant to be a totalizing. To be totalizing would mean the utter intentional extermination – intentionally enacting cruelty - all other co-existing truly local cultures. From the Wynterian Approach the dominant discourse represents mis-education and sociogeny. Mis-education is the intentional exclusion of information from a story to support one human group's claim as superior to another human group, which in turn serves as justification for the superior group's access to material abundance and the best educational institutions. Sociogeny is how the society from which this supposedly superior group derives its understanding of the world and the humans in it actually comes to understand the world in the way it does.

The sociogeny affects the psychology of the person who is tagged as less-than-human/colonized because he/she gains yet another liminal image of the self through the multiple and whimsical ways in which the dominant society chooses to use its semiotic deployments – language, signs and symbols – spoken, drawn, written by groups and individuals of any age to fix a person in a place unchosen by herself/himself. This intentional education is an enactment of cruelty that distorts the self-image of the Fanon. In France, the little boy exclaiming to his mother while recoiling in fear that he saw a Negro, who was Fanon, the colonized, who had been mis-educated to believe he was really a White Frenchman, is the victim of an enactment of cruelty that the little boy. The little White French boy, though innocent, has demonstrated that he been properly acculturated as a full human in terms of being repulsed by those he has been taught are less-than-human – Blacks. This profoundly hurt Fanon, psychologically, as he had always viewed himself like a true pure Frenchman – a White Frenchman - as he had been taught through the enacted sociogeny of the formal French colonial education system - to view himself as derived from the Germanic tribe, the Gauls who settled in France and to be suspicious or hostile to anyone who is Black including himself.

The purpose of the Wynterian Approach is to avoid, inasmuch as possible if the writer/researcher is acting in good faith, a distorted, unconnected Social Studies. Curriculum can suffer from a “branch plant mentality” (Wynter, 1970), which means for Wynter that the local culture – in this case a local culture that remains a local culture and

is not distorted, inasmuch as possible, by being transformed into a dominant discourse – as happened with the local cultures of Castile and Aragon and Portugal - that dwarfs and batters the other true local cultures. As mentioned before, Castile and Aragon – Hispanic culture - and Portugal – Lusophone culture - were all local cultures wedded to a particular peninsula, the Iberian, in West Europe. Due to an accident of geography with a location on the Atlantic Ocean and Mediterranean Sea just ten miles from Africa with its mixed Arab, Islamic, Bedouin, and sub-Saharan cultures allowed for the transmission of advanced Arab and Asian sailing technologies along with Arab interpretations of “lost” Greek and Roman technologies that enriched Hispanic and Lusophone cultures. These new technologies, ways of knowing, were combined with a standard Roman Catholic Christian theocratic universalism which elevated the “spreading of the True Faith” – Roman Catholicism - as the ultimate *raison d’etre* for the search for new trade routes to Asia as ways to make money and the justification for the expropriation of land from non-Christians re-termed as “discovery.”

Noting the above terms – “True Faith” and “discovery” – means that a curriculum of harm is developed and implemented that seeks to camouflage itself as “always doing good” or “always encouraging good/God Works through the proper use of the Holy Word.” These terms represent the names of “thick descriptions” which Wynter argues are ways to unethically hide harm and so reinterpret trauma enacted by intentional physical and psychological assault upon humans who have been reinterpreted unbeknownst to

themselves as “less than human” or “savages” who occupy “terra nullius” and, therefore, have only an at best tenuous right to existence, according to a dominant discourse thick description interpretation of “True Faith” and “discovery.” Wynter terms this a “sickness” (Wynter, 2006, 2000, 1995, 1992[1990], 1970) that dispossesses the true local culture and the humans who live that local culture as their everyday culture because they invented it – this is authenticity.

These tendencies toward interdisciplinarity and pluridisciplinarity means that Wynter has taken a stand in line with two of her main influences, Carter G. Woodson (1933) and his “Mis-education theory” along with Franz Fanon (1952) and his “sociogenic approach” to free those who have been made marginal, erased and silenced. Marginalized and erased can be associated with Joyce E. King’s (1991) concept of “dysconsciouness” which means to habitually enact and operationalize harm through unquestioned harmful attitudes and the actions that emerge from those harmful unchallenged attitudes. The common stand that Wynter (2006, 2000, 1995, 1992[1990]) takes when she combines Woodson (1933) and Fanon (1952) is an abhorrence of committing intentional harm. The intentional harm is committed through the misrepresentation of humans and their cultures, all local cultures, as being valueless. Woodson’s concept of mis-education was about stating that he found the intentional abuse of formal academic disciplines through intentionally incomplete and skewed research to develop curricula in any discipline. These curricula that permeated the, and

still does, public school systems and the private schools at primary, secondary, and university level across the United States and manifested in the institutions of entertainment and sports to everyday actions like shopping and riding public transportation re-enforced a dominance discourse that demonstrated materially, linguistically, juridically that people of African descent, Blacks, were always already inferior at birth. Woodson then demonstrated how this problem could be corrected. Fanon's (1952) concept of sociogeny argues that humans are fundamentally shaped psychologically through social interpretations of varying cultures compared on a scale read as texts to develop a false hierarchy of inferior and superior.

In Fanon's (1952) case he explained how as an Black French colonial, specifically in Martinique living as an African Caribbean colonial, he was taught in school curricula which were developed in France to view himself as a White descendant of the Gauls. At home and in Martinican society he was taught that speaking perfect French was a mark of worthiness and distinction because French was the language of civilization. He was also taught to hunger for his true homeland, France. The problem was that in France he was viewed as a "Black" and his excellent French did not matter as 'being French' was equated with "being White." French culture in France taught them that Whites were superior to all peoples of the world who were naturally, therefore, subhuman. Wynter's scholarship argues that these outlooks of intentional harm are a root cause of social disharmony as these outlooks normalize the exclusion of Blacks foremost and then

altered a bit allow for exclusion of women, non-English speakers, all non-Whites, gays, lesbians and transgendered people, disabled people.

Chapter 6

“Truth is powerful and it prevails.” - Sojourner

A Summation of What Wynter Offers

This chapter will begin by re-stating the two research questions that have driven the purpose of this paper. After that these two focal questions will be discussed with respect to the findings that emerged from the research project. After that there are four research-related items to discuss; three that appeared in earlier chapters and one that makes a final case for Wynter’s inclusion into the social studies education canon because her work advances the possible uses of social studies education research. The two research questions around which this paper revolves are:

1) How does the Wynterian Approach of Sylvia Wynter, anchored in her Black Studies Perspective, help to interpret and examine social studies figures and social studies events in K-12 Texas history?

2) How does the Wynterian Approach of Sylvia Wynter provide new conceptual approach to examining social studies figures and social studies events in K-12 Texas History

I first will discuss my findings in relation to the research questions. Then second I will discuss my findings in relation to the literature on historical thinking and historical consciousness, and the literature of social studies education curriculum scholars who can be grouped as “reconceptualists.” Then I will discuss the case of Stephen F. Austin as it

relates to the teaching of the Texas History. Finally I will discuss that concerns of why Wynter's work is important as a way to advance social studies education curriculum research. In all of these discussions I used the Wynterian Approach as filter as I have determined that this research filter developed by Professor Sylvia Wynter has the potential to advance the research scope of social studies education in terms of pedagogy and curriculum development. The research questions are meant to take me into using the Wynterian Approach to examine the literatures that are important to social studies education – historical thinking and historical consciousness as well as that of curriculum scholarship. After that the Wynterian Approach as applied to the study of Stephen F. Austin as icon in various texts – instructional materials, textbooks, and sites of public memories. Finally, I discuss Sylvia Wynter's work in terms of advancing the social studies education discipline in new directions.

What is the Wynterian Approach?

Sylvia Wynter offers us the Wynterian Approach. This is the set of tools that she uses to evaluate historical situations in search for answer to her central question: What does it mean to be human? I detected the Wynterian Approach by performing a thorough reading of all of Wynter's scholarly writings, the notes within those writings, and the bibliographies she used to develop her ideas. What is very noticeable is that Sylvia Wynter never limited herself to ideas from any single academic field nor to ideas rooted in any academic disciplines canon nor to scholarly works from a particular geography or

race or gender or physical ability or language. For Wynter, anything created by humans potentially could yield a useful idea if it actually assists in clarifying what it means to be human by having a high probability of supporting the development and maintenance of human dignity in other humans – the Praxis of being Human (McKittrick, 2015, 2000).

The Wynterian Approach contains five tools: 1) Sociogenic Principle; 2) Subjective Understanding; 3) Alternative Cultural Model; 4) Liminality; 5) Rejection of Cruelty. The sociogenic principle is derived from the work of two scholars – Franz Fanon (1952) and Carter G. Woodson (1933). Franz Fanon postulated the theory of sociogeny as a psychological concept that explained that humans come to know themselves and so develop their sense of being – ontogeny – through the semiotics (signs, symbols, texts, languages) that are used to describe them or situate them in a society with respect to other defined people. Woodson developed the theory of mis-education that explained how a society could have a dominant culture to which all members of that society are exposed. Exposures take place in human-developed institutions such as education, media, entertainment, politics, economics – all social situations from which access can be blocked or granted. These exposures that reflect the dominant culture (White Supremacy and White Americans) and determine perceived access or lack of access to social institutions are done intentionally to harm a designated group – Blacks – or benefit a designated group – Whites. The objective of mis-education is to destroy the ability of the

humans in the group designated for harm to view themselves as useful even to themselves.

Subjective understanding is the ability of the human to articulate a story for herself/himself that expresses how he/she interprets one's overlapping environments – mental spaces, geographic spaces, fantasy spaces. The problem that arises is that before a human can express how he/she interprets these overlapping environments he/she is exposed to the sociogeny of those same overlapping environments. That means that a human is pre-exposed to already existing information before reaching the ability to be fully cognizant and exercise reasonably full control over where one is situated. When one recognizes that he/she has the ability to express her/his thoughts about the complex world in which he/she lives and register a subjective understanding the problem that arises is whether one has received only limited exposures to ideas rooted mainly in a dominant culture, a native cultural model, that enacts harm to designated groups intentionally and , later, dysconsciously. If one has received sufficient exposures to other cultures that do not mimic the dominant culture then one could develop a worldview that interprets the world through alternative cultural models – the liminal outlook of the intentionally historically harmed (Wynter, 2015, 2000, 1995, 1994, 1992[1990], 1962).

The alternative cultural model is a way of interpreting the world of overlapping environments from simultaneously outside and inside the dominant culture. This ability of the harmed humans to see the duality of existence is called “double consciousness”

(Du Bois, 1903) and is a result of the “color line” (Du Bois, 1903) that was imposed by the native cultural model – the dominant culture. In the United States Blacks and Native Americans and Mexican Americans have historically occupied the liminal space of the oppressed and as a result have developed many alternative cultural models that support their human dignity while still allowing them to see and contest the problems of the native cultural model – dominant culture (Wynter, 2015, 2000, 1995, 1992[1990]; Legesse, 1973).

Liminality is a concept developed by Legesse (1973). This term refers to the intentional differentiation made by race to justify the separation of Whites and Blacks based on a presumption of White superiority and Black inferiority as normal. Whites /Europeans beginning in colonization by Spain and repeated in the colonies of Portugal, France, the Netherlands, and England all put into place social arrangements that reflected each of their local cultures in their home nations. The humans who were selected-out as “natural slaves” and innately inferior were peoples of African descent/Blacks/Negros and people who were original inhabitants/Native Americans/American Indians/Indios who were branded as inferior uncivilized savages. These two selected-out groups became the liminal group that occupied the bottom of each of these European native cultural models. The liminal group continued to preserve their cultures but in the face of being assaulted daily by the native cultural model the liminal group developed a series of alternative cultural models that contained by varying degrees portion of the native cultural model re-

purposed and re-interpreted to be meshed and made hybrid thus contesting total dominance and erasure (Burkholder, 2014; Veracini, 2010; Leary, 2005; Eyerman 2001; Wade, 1997; Wynter, 1995; Carew, 1988).

Rejection of cruelty is determined through the evaluation of the definitely unnecessary unneeded intentional actions that are cruel (sociopathic or psychopathic) – utterances and behaviors. The actions show when filtered through the social studies disciplines of anthropology, economics, geography, history, political science, psychology, sociology that definite choices were made that would result in definite harm to a group of people resulting in some sort of material deprivation vital to existence, physical harm and life endangerment, or cause psychological harm. Rejection of cruelty, if unintentional, is the outcome of cruel dysconscious acts definitely placed another group in a harmful situation that was likely observable (e.g. enslavement, forced labor, lack of clothing, lack of food, subject to forced sex, forced to watch loved ones being tortured or sold off to places unknown, begging for basic kindness, marginalization, silencing, teaching to self-hate) (Leary, 2005; Eyerman, 2001; Carew, 1988; Wynter, 2015, 1995, 1962; Veracini, 2010).

The tools of the Wynterian Approach are human-made. This means that when used they are not meant to supply an uncontestable answers as this is the problem of the native cultural model. The reasonable logical and deep explanation that emerges from the application of the Wynterian Approach ought to provide multiple alternative cultural

models that stand as counternarratives of equal stature to the native cultural model/dominance discourse. An inclusive canon for social studies education could emerge from this in which more people see themselves as legitimately having a voice that can be made anthropological, economic, geographic, historical, political, psychological, or sociological at one and the same time or in different moments. This is contingency which is very human because the best that humans can do is to keep striving in good faith to improve their abilities to support the human-ness in their fellow humans (Wynter, 2015, 2000, 1995, 1962).

Research Questions Revisited

These two questions will be discussed together as they are related and overlapping. In both questions an admission that the Texas Education Agency develops the Texas social studies curriculum at the official behest of the elected State Board of Education. This is an often overlooked truth about the creation of all curricula in Texas and, in particular, the social studies curricula with special attention in this paper given to the fourth (4th) grade and seventh (7th) grade curricula which is Texas Social Studies and popularly called Texas History & Geography. This course is considered sacrosanct in terms of being a beacon of preserving and advancing Texas culture through time and is, therefore, caught up at the epicenter of the deployment of the dominant discourse or native cultural model (Wynter 1992[1990], pg. 9). To accomplish the task of preservation and advancement of Texas culture instructional materials are developed by capitalist

businesses who use the TEA-created SBOE-adopted guidelines as the chief source of what needs to be in the instructional materials to be acceptable to a politically motivated public institution.

What is happening with these instructional materials and curricula is a process of maintaining the development of a sacred identity or if one could re-conceptualize, an official state iconography is put into place that serves a giant pool of identity-renewal. All students and residents of Texas are exposed to this iconography through choices made in public institutions (e.g. public school districts and the Texas State Board of Education) by elected public officials and unelected public bureaucrats, and private citizen-bureaucrats who support a particular outlook on life (e.g. Republican Party and Democratic Party and the National Rifle Association and religious organizations). The iconography can be contested but by and large certain stories emerge as dominant and gain greater currency with repetition over time (e.g. Stephen F. Austin as Father of Texas and ultimate Texas icon), which means that rarely is the dominant image challenged. This is what could be considered the development of an essential state identity, which while appearing to be inclusive is actually a massively exclusionary “imagined” community (Anderson 1989; Wynter, 1992[1990]; Wynter, 1984). To evaluate in this way the links between real-world politics and the supposedly neutral-world of curriculum is not addressed anywhere in SBOE-adopted official state curricula for the course of Texas social studies.

The Wynterian Approach challenges the developers of curricula to question the nature of how their narratives are made and lapse into becoming just one story of intentional aggression and harm aimed at a given group of humans by another group who consider themselves innately and culturally superior. In social studies history became a narration of progress that justified oppression as necessary, blessed, and normal (Wynter 2000, pg.98). What allows for such thoughts to come into existence so these thoughts can be turned into directed actions and weighted signs and symbols that are designed to harm psychologically and physically? The Wynterian Approach sums this question up with: What does it mean to be human?

Imagine Texas social studies curricula for fourth (4th) graders and seventh (7th) graders aimed at unearthing the key question of “What does it mean to be human?” How does this allow new concepts and alignments of ideas to emerge that actually benefit students for 21st century problem-solving that requires flexible thinking and the ability to comprehend and later analyze data and apply it to different situations and then evaluate the outcomes in terms of intentional harms and unintentional harms and/or intentional benefits and unintentional benefits to humans involved and uninvolved? Suddenly the social studies is no longer a narrow compilation of victimizations of non-European peoples, especially Africans termed “negros”/Blacks and selected European peoples (Slavs) by Western European (English, French, Portuguese, Spanish) and Anglo-

Americans self-termed as *limpieza de sangre*/Blanca/Whites. Instead a rich multi-layered set of narratives become possible (Wynter, 2000, p. 177). Why?

European culture represents a native cultural model. The native cultural model tells the story of a local culture that has become unnecessarily and wrongly outsized to its original charge. Originally, the native cultural model became a dominant discourse elevating one local culture to a position of supreme dominance over all other local cultures. The local culture that remains a true local culture is called an alternative cultural model and it stands side-by-side not necessarily in opposition to the native cultural model. The alternative cultural models opens a rupture through which excluded narratives can now be seen and heard. The Wynterian Approach insists that one remembers that every cultural model is human-made and so necessarily must be imperfect. This embrace of the imperfection of the human-made is another issue that gives the Wynterian Approach so much power. Right here the issue of student motivation in schools as a high need is shown. Woodson (1933) spoke to this as mis-education wherein curricula are developed that intentionally demotivate targeted students – Black students – who only see themselves victimized, ignored and demeaned in the instructional materials which happens to match their lived social situation of material deprivation in politics, economics, and consumption (Wynter, 2000, p. 199; Wynter, 1992[1990], p.20 - 33).

Taken together the Wynterian Approach insists on a multi-perspective view be applied to every instance of social studies research. No problem is just a simple unchallenged stand-alone dominance narrative. For example, when examining Stephen F. Austin the instructional materials and curricula show him to be a leader. The Wynterian Approach demands that this term “leader” be examined for its immediate placement in the instructional materials, such as the textbook and how mentioned in the curricula. These are easy and immediate examples to find. Wynterian Approach then asks: How did Stephen F. Austin as human in his time think about other humans who looked like him and did not resemble himself? This question gets at the idea of “subjective understanding” (Wynter, 2006, 2003, 2000, 1995, 1992[1990]) which demands that the perspective of a given social studies actor be analyzed to know whether his thinking was a product of his time and whether there were other viewpoints he could have plausibly taken but opted not to do so. This is intentionality which gives purpose to human thoughts as they become human actions that have real life outcomes of harm and benefit. Also by evaluating the term “leader” we can get at the “sociogenic principle”(Wynter, 2006, 2003, 2000, 1995, 1992[1990]) which demands an analysis of the dominant discourses socio-cultural definition and expectations of a leader. This takes us to how we are told a leader should look and speak according to criteria pre-determined by the dominance cultural discourse – narrow gauge misapplication of a local culture misidentified as always-already-superior to all other cultures that then must be obliterated (Wynter, 2006, 2000, 1992[1990]).

In the case of Stephen F. Austin, I find that he is regarded as a natural leader because he is White, a man, English-speaking, college-educated, a slaveowner, regarded as honest, and skilled in surveying, hunting, and Spanish-speaking. This listing of attributes takes the students into the zeitgeist of Stephen F. Austin's lifetime as we discover these supposedly universal leadership attributes that were expected in Austin's lifetime. This rundown of leadership attribute tells a classroom of students a message that some of them if not White and male cannot hope to aspire to be leaders while, also, inviting an investigation into how could these definitions of leader be so limiting and exclusionary. However, a question must be posed: Were there any other definitions of leader that co-existed and challenged with the exclusionary definition that benefitted Austin in his lifetime? Also, the question that arises is how did Blacks view Austin as a leader given their exclusion from being leaders? This is the depth of research that can be done. These are not simple counter-narratives but instead rhizomic searches that logically seek out related thoughts and relevant thoughts where the connection must be explained to have legitimacy. I concur with Wynter on the point of Austin's leadership when I found that based upon the ideas current at the time and Austin's own actions that he emerges a liberal and a populist. Such a finding elevates the designation of a leader into a complex phenomenon because as a liberal it means that the actor had to do things such make decisions about land distribution and suitable agriculture for the future – cotton – that allied him with export cash crop supporters not only in the southern United States but

also Mexican liberals who wanted a cash crop export economy (Campbell, 1989; Cantrell, 1999).

Wynter demands an exhaustive and logical explanation wherein the links to the original ideas are explained as Wynter. Given this, an exhaustive examination of Stephen F. Austin as icon would demand that one examine Mexican law and Spanish law as these existed during Austin's lifetime. Not only that but Mexican culture and social organization would need to be examined to see if it compares to US culture and social organization at the time Austin's lived. The Wynterian Approach demands depth and breadth of research as from each examination native cultural models will be both re-enforced and challenged while alternative cultural models will emerge and come to co-exist opening spaces for voices of humans who had been erased or issues that were ignored in curricula and instructional materials dedicated to following the limited though official curricula .

The Wynterian Approach in relation to the Literature of Historical Thinking and Historical Consciousness and Curriculum Scholarship

The literature of social studies education curriculum is vast. Given this, I chose to discuss in relation to the Wynterian Approach the scholarship of historical thinking and historical consciousness as well as the scholarship of the reconceptualists. The scholars of historical thinking and historical consciousness are heavily concerned with the development of higher order thinking skills in students and for that matter in teacher.

Their work examines ways in which pedagogy could be developed to facilitate the development of thinking about history critically and applying lessons from that historical thinking to everyday life to solve problems. Also, this scholarship examines how public memory, heritage, and citizenship affect the development of historical thinking and historical consciousness. Initially one would assume that this is in line with the Wynterian Approach as these are skills that she advocates developing; however, a problem arises.

In relation to the Wynterian Approach the scholarship on historical thinking and historical consciousness tends to fall uniformly within an advocacy of the dominant cultural narrative rooted in the White Supremacy of Western European and an Anglo-American or Franco-American. Historical thinking, although it revolves around social issues, the issues chosen for examination does not appear to advance knowledge into the understanding of how non-Whites might have developed a viewpoint on given issues. As far as historical consciousness goes another hole opens because one does not see how issues that concern issues surrounding historical consciousness as acted out in the past by non-Whites and by non-Europeans. If public memory and heritage and citizenship, determine what is to be taught in learning how to historically think and develop historical consciousness then a serious problem of exclusion arises. Wynter addressed this issue when she criticized the textbook developers pushing of the idea that the U.S. was simply a “land of immigrants,” because this conceptualization of the US was dishonest. All U.S.

groups did not enter the US as immigrants searching for a better life. This is the American myth of progress for Europeans now all re-classified as Whites which does not fit the coming-to-America experience of Black Americans and Native Americans and Asian Americans and Mexican Americans (Wynter, 1992[1990], p. 8-10). The Wynterian Approach would demand, again, a multi-perspective outlook that moves historical thinking and historical consciousness out of simply stating a case that re-enforces White hegemony and European hegemony as the only lenses through which we must learn to view social studies issues, events and actors. What is forgotten is that “all Whites benefitted from White Supremacy” (Wynter 1990; pg.363) no matter their social position because there were material, social, and psychological pay-offs from being considered. By only generating problems rooted in this viewpoint, whether intentional or not, the curricula of historical thinking becomes implicated in doing damage through mis-education in that the limited problems that students are invited to solve does nothing to expand their horizons into considering alternative culture models. The current direction of historical thinking and historical consciousness seems to advocate if societies choose not to engage in analyzing and discovering the thoughts, collectively and individually, of Black humans by placing explicit issues that are experienced more in Black communities or by Blacks as individuals, due to ingrained “dysconscious racism” (King, 1991) then that type of limiting “sociogenic principle” is just fine (Wynter, 2006, p. 116-118). Historical thinking and historical consciousness must be put at the service of a building a

socially just and human rights supportive environment that is expressed in curricula and instructional materials.

The reconceptualists tend to examine a significant social studies events and social studies actors by first retracing the original dominance discourse sanctioned research done on the particular topic as done that situates all things within a White Supremacist advocacy framework. After that they develop a counter-narrative that exposes and deconstructs the problems with the presentation of a particular social studies event or social studies actor in terms of how the story does not actually demonstrate a shift away from the dominance discourse but rather is a distortion. For example, the reconceptualists have examined the lives of Rosa Parks, Martin Luther King, Jr., and the *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954) decision. The reconceptualists found that frequently these actors and events which in their times were viewed a highly problematic and very socially dangerous – race-mixing in schools would lead to interracial marriages – somehow were re-told as having been in-step with the values of all Americans, especially White America all along. In other cases, the crass politics of the situation was exposed and explained which took away the high ideals that supposedly supported a given outcome.

The Wynterian Approach introducing students to high rigor in a comparative setting as there are no easily standardized rational explanations. The Wynterian Approach could cause a supposedly simple piece of research into a journey that takes the researcher through all social studies disciplines. Wynter (1970), for example, in “Jonkonnu”

challenges the traditional view that research on a Black society and Black issue must be done from a perspective that primitives the research participants and downplays or radically misstates given aspects of their cultures. Instead what Wynter shows is that Jonkonnu, a dance rooted in evolving African rhythms mixed with certain European dance steps, had many different forms that were peculiar to a given area's experience with white settler colonialism. Wynter took this to show that this evolution involved political, economic, social and geographic reasons, which she then described. Now a challenge to standard social studies research methods had arisen. With the Wynterian Approach there is always an alternative cultural model that can be found, studied, and linked logically to create sound research from outside of the canon which provides new arguments and knowledge that stand alongside already persistent though increasingly indefensible native cultural models. This is the utility of the Wynterian Approach . I found that in examining Stephen F. Austin as Father of Texas that this opened quickly to a series of related topics dealing first with the meaning of "father" and secondly with a questioning of what actions does a father take to advance his family. Stephen F. Austin is presented as a father who is always on the move and always worried about his "children" – the White settlers in his colony. The actions deal with everything from choosing the best type of government to demanding that the settlers be hardworking people of good character and high morals. It is on this imposition of values that yet another instance of rigor enters the study of Stephen F. Austin, because the standards he set to allow a White settler to gain land from him never viewed the ownership of Black human beings as

immoral nor a sign of not being hardworking (Campbell, 1989; Cantrell, 1999) . This is highly ironic and typical of the narrow definitions used by supporters of the native cultural model that always distorts human reality in such a way as to squeeze the actual ethics and human dignity out of it. Despite this that very deep question of morals is linked to the Wynterian Approach's insistence on examining social studies actions for cruelty. Cruelty would encompass the enslavement of Black human beings.

Filtering Teaching the Texas Social Studies Curricula and Gap Exposure with the Wynterian Approach

I used the Wynterian Approach to examine the Texas state social studies curricula (TEKS) at the fourth (4th) grade and seventh (7th) grade levels with respect to Stephen F. Austin in the teaching of Texas social studies. Also, Stephen F. Austin was examined with respect to how his image appears in sites of public memory. I found that within the two Texas social studies curricula Stephen F. Austin appears as a significant individual whose accomplishments need to be taught and learned. There is no significant addition within the TEKS to encourage a deepening of the examination of Stephen F. Austin as a man in general, a White man, a frontiersman, a slaveowner, an oppressor, or as a citizen of Mexico. Within the instructional materials for the fourth (4th) and seventh (7th) grades I found that Stephen F. Austin was presented by three themes: 1) Father of Texas; 2) Empresario; 3) Liberal Populist Statesman. All of these feed into the fact that the

instructional materials offer nothing remotely negative about Stephen F Austin. So Austin is presented as the Icon of Texas – an unchanging marker of perfection.

When filtering Stephen F. Austin as themed icon using the Wynterian Approach, a lot of gaps for further research emerges. The problem with the TEKS not offering significant ways to problematize the life of Austin as a social studies actor is that the TEKS then fail to prepare students for the 21st Century complexities of evaluative data-driven problem solving. I found that Stephen F. Austin could have been studied in the ways that represent an advance in social studies education for Texas that were attached to each of the themes. First as empresario, Austin could have been examined according to his role as a legal representative of the government of Mexico in terms of law enforcement and cultural enforcement even as he was a native Anglo-American.

I found that an examination of the legal code that Austin developed for his colony would need to be examined as his legal code had to serve as a bridge between United States legal traditions that most of Austin's colonists brought with them and Mexican legal traditions that Austin was expected to enforce as his colonists were required to take an oath to Mexico. In addition, given that Austin advocated for his Anglo-American colonists to be allowed to bring their enslaved Blacks, Austin wrote a slave code. This slave code then represents a violation of Mexican law which Austin had taken an oath to uphold. In addition there is no in-depth study of the continuation of legal policy established by the Spaniards that continued into the newly independent Mexico that

would affect Austin's colony. For example, Austin inherited the *casta* system, which was a system of social organization that gave every Spaniard and then Mexican his place in society as compared to his betters (Dussel, 2013). Also, the role of women, all women, in these co-existing societies within Texas is ever discussed. The only women mentioned are survivors of the Alamo and a *ranchera*. If Austin inherited a legal code that went back to 1519 and 1492 that would mean he had inherited a legal code that supported the system of social discrimination which was also racial economic and geographic as all of these were effected by how one was perceived publically (Pugsley & Duncan, 2010; Haynes and Winz, 2001).

I found that another problem that concurs with Wynter (1992[1990]) was with the obfuscating language of the instructional materials. All of them do not tell the truth about the fact that enslaved Blacks were tortured. Moreover, the use of the term Anglo-American ignores the fact that the ethno-linguistic term "Anglo" means English-speaking rather than the term White. Given this the term "Anglo" could be applied to the enslaved Blacks who would be Black-Anglo-Americans. At no point in the instructional materials nor in the TEKS that the instructional materials match is there any attempt to assist students in defining the terms "ethnic" and "racial" and explaining the difference. Also, at no point is the term "White settler" substituted for "Anglo-American" This means the reality of what the implantation of a White settler colony means is never addressed. The TEKS and the instructional materials do not provide a discussion of the fact that the oath

the Anglo-Americans took to gain the cheap, payment-cheap, tax-deferred land of Mexico was repeatedly and knowingly broken. This is significant because it drives to the iconographic ideal of perfection – honesty - that Stephen F. Austin represents and by extension with which supposed to infuse his eager colonists.

Finally, Austin as liberal, populist statesman means that he was deeply involved in creating economic development policies that helped his colonists. Here a shift occurs in the meaning of liberal and populist. At this point a discussion of economic issues must be initiated to explain the meaning of “liberal” and “populist” and “statesman.” The liminal categories are “liberal” and “populist.” “Liberal” which means people who want to open the economy to all types of trade with minimal restrictions on trade and any government regulation that would be harmed by government regulation. “Populist” means a man of the people who supports their desires to expand and enjoy success. The problem again is that the TEKS nor the instructional materials are honest about race. Here what occurs is an opportunity to study “whiteness” as good for the people of Austin’s colonies. For Austin to be an effective “liberal” and “populist” he had to embrace “whiteness” although he never mentions this but his policies (slave code/land distribution) do (Pugsley & Duncan, 2010; Campbell, 1989). None of these possibilities are mentioned in the TEKS.

I found at the sites of public memory that the narrative of Stephen F. Austin as “Father of Texas” and “great leader” are the only that appear. The sites of public memory are not mentioned directly in the TEKS. A vague reference to museums exist but mainly

as a non-specified general reminder I visited several sites of public memory. I found that the image of Stephen F. Austin as icon is held stable. At the sites of public memory one is able to see how Austin is placed. In the Texas State Cemetery his marker is the second largest in the cemetery. At Stephen F. Austin State University and the Texas Capitol there are statues of Austin. Every statue depicts Austin as heroic in stature and manner and even in costume/dress.

I have found that in teaching Texas social studies the Wynterian Approach has allowed me to push my seventh (7th) grade Texas social studies students into new directions. For example, I have created displays that ask Wynter's central question: What does it mean to be human? This question then frames the rest of the school year as I insist that my students use this question to think through ideas. The students must be taught that social studies deals with the analysis of the chosen behaviors of humans and the outcomes from those choices. These become the foundation for the rest of the schoolyear. The students learn quickly that there are very few unchallenged answers and that preparation and integrity are key to becoming a high quality student who earns high grades.

By using the Wynterian Approach with my students they begin to identify "squirm-points." These are points that emerge that do not fit the logic of a story of continuous progress for all Americans. Here Sylvia Wynter's book, *Do Not Call Us Negroes* (1992[1990]), comes into play because the students are taught to read carefully and, also

through attentive active listening to identify points of failure of logic. For example, with the idea of Columbus as discoverer, the students are invited to recreate the logic that Columbus employed to reach his conclusions by which he proposed his trip to Ferdinand and Isabella. This is very important because the TEKS do not attempt even in the sixth (6th) grade TEKS to study Columbus in depth. Hence Columbus remains a rotting icon of greatness who wrought mass destruction. By using the Wynterian Approach my students are expected to examine Columbus from the standpoints of religion and canon law, literature of his time, his career, geographic myths, the Reconquista.

The zeitgeist of Columbus was the ending of the Middle Ages and the beginning of the Renaissance. Given this Columbus was born in Genoa, a powerful independent Apennine Peninsula city-state of the Mediterranean Sea. This establishes Columbus' career as a logical outcome from his childhood. After that the students learn that Columbus sailed for the Portuguese and as a result had sailed up and down the coast of West Africa. This means that Columbus along with other fellow sailors had found a possible crack in the logic of official Roman Catholic Church myth about how the world worked. Columbus found that there was likely no Sea of Darkness, which was realm of Satan, which in turn made the world "*Terra Nullis*" – uninhabitable land - below Cape Bojador on the West African coast. The myth stated that the land was uninhabitable because it was too hot and the heat would turn the skin black. Columbus deduced properly that he had bought African slaves in the area considered uninhabitable,

therefore, the seas were navigable so Asia could be reached (Burkholder, 2014; Chasteen, 2011; Smallwood & Elliot, 1997).

My students learn that the books, *The Travels of Marco Polo*, *The Bible*, and the works of Ptolemy, the ancient Greek geographer, influenced Columbus' outlook about the fact that he might well sail west to get to the East. Here the students discover that Columbus had engaged in the slave trade and that African slaves had been in Spain and Portugal since at least the 1480's. The students find that Columbus had presented his idea to the King of Portugal who rejected the idea because of Portuguese progress exploring the West coast of Africa. The students then find that Columbus was financed by Queen Isabella because she was Queen-in-Her-own-Right which meant that she partially financed Columbus and gave him the ships and men in return for a *quintero* – 20% of the takings. In addition, the students find that the Pope issued a papal decree, canon law, that allowed Spain to claim all territory and enslave all heathens in perpetuity and forgive anyone who had to commit murder while trying to spread the True Faith, Roman Catholicism. The students then are asked to make linkages between the end of Reconquista in 1492 and the financing of Columbus' voyage. The students, therefore, learn about Islam and the hybrid culture of Muslim Spain that married the Roman Catholic culture with Islamic culture with Jewish culture and Visigoth Germanic culture and Arabic culture along with sub-Saharan Africans and people from Southwest Asia and the Arabian Peninsula. The actions taken by Columbus and his men from the first voyage

in 1492 established the blueprint for how Spanish colonial rule would be established throughout the world. At this point the students then receive a bit of shock that comes from one of Columbus' men, Bartolome de Las Casas (1552), who writes a book about the horrible actions taken by Columbus and his men to plunder the Taino peoples of all of their wealth. At this point the students learn about the casta system, the encomienda system, the rancho system, and how Spanish enslavement functioned for Africans (Burkholder and Johnson, 2014; Burkholder 2012; Chasteen, 2011; Gaetano, 1997). The Wynterian Approach ensures that the students will be kept happily engaged as their discoveries give them more confidence to engage in discussions about other topics where they see modern connections. This is but one example of how the Wynterian Approach promotes a fullness of engagement with any topic. The gaps are exposed by the students. All the teacher needs is a full intellectual capacity to work well and usefully with her/his students.

Future Research Directions in Texas Social Studies

The objective of the Wynterian Approach is to extend scholarship into directions not viewed as important by those who exclusively abide by the dominance discourse of the native cultural model. Developing alternative cultural models from the position of liminality is one of the chief uses of the Wynterian Approach. In the case of Texas Social Studies evidence that it clearly belongs to the native cultural model is demonstrated by the SBOE-approved Texas State Agency-composed curricula at the fourth (4th) grade and

seventh (7th) grade that fails to use anything except an additive approach to Texas Social Studies. An additive approach means that non-Whites are added to the list of requirements about which students ought to learn as an aside but never as the main topic or central understanding.

Given this, with respect to the geographic location and the multiple nations that have voluntarily and involuntarily peopled Texas there are many overlooked groups. The histories of the Afro-Mexicans and Black Texans are two very much understudied groups. They represent an enjoyable adventure because historian Gerald Horne (2005) points out that these groups were constantly intermingling on the borderlands of Texas, New Mexico, Arizona and Mexico. Anthropologist Peter Wade (1997) agrees with Horne suggesting that Africans, Native Mexicans, and Mexicans all lived in a liminal space that could at a moment's notice shift from being more repressive to less repressive depending on the ways in which they as a combined group or as individual groups were viewed by the Hispanic Mexicans and southern Anglo-American Whites on both sides of the Texas-Mexico border. The history becomes more intricate when one adds to the mix the language of Afro-Mexican communities (Githiora, 2008) along with the interpolation of Afro-Mexicans in Hispanic Mexican dominated popular culture (Hernandez Cuevas, 2004). Attention to the language of Afro-Mexicans focuses attention on Afro-Mexican communities that persisted in preserving their cultures over long periods of time within specific local geographies (Githiora, 2008). The attention to Afro-Mexicans in the

popular media and entertainment industry of Mexico could be used as way to gauge the forced invisibility of the African elements of Mexican culture, which officially views itself as “a cosmic race” of Mestizo people (Hernandez Cuevas, 2004; Wade, 1997). These explorations could provide a much richer Texas Social Studies over simply looking at statues of Stephen F. Austin.

Scholars Influenced by Wynter

Sylvia Wynter is a force in the academic world. Her ideas have influenced scholars across the world. The Wynterian Approach that I have postulated has been of use in part or in whole to researchers who seek to explain how to create a more human world from many disciplines. In the field of education, Joyce E. King (1991), a student of Sylvia Wynter, developed the ideas of “dysconscious racism” to explain the unfortunate habit of mind of automatically consigning Black people, c whether students or teachers, to the pile designated as useless without necessary knowledge or overly dangerous in need of external force to control. King excoriates this negative habit of mind that consigns Blacks to the bottom of all social, political, economic, intelligence hierarchies by investigating its genesis and then suggesting ways to transform this negative into a positive that helps all humans. King’s scholarship is inclusive and along with Ellen Swartz they seek to prevent the further “epistemological annihilation” of not just Black people but anyone designated as innately lacking some necessary cultural capital (King and Swartz, 2014). Another scholar and student of Sylvia Wynter, Gloria Ladson-Billings (1995) developed

the idea of “culturally relevant pedagogy,” in which teachers engage students by learning about the student’s homelife and preferences for learning styles while at the same time consistently encouraging the student the necessary skills for success in a particular subject. Teachers build a community that wraps around the student, who in turns knows that he/she has a safe space to develop in a loving yet demanding culture of learning. Other scholars - Demetrius Eudell, Carol Boyce Davies, Natasha Barnes, and Katherine McKittrick have used the ideas professed by Sylvia Wynter as a way to delve deeper into the dominance discourses that serve as canons in academic fields and the alternative cultural narratives that emerge as a result of that delving. All of these scholars share the same passion of Sylvia Wynter in that they all seek to create a world where all humans are encouraged to support the development of human dignity in others through their individual and collective actions.

The Importance of Wynter to Social Studies Education

Sylvia Wynter is important to social studies education because she advances the discipline to a new level. The broad question around which she revolves her research is: What does it mean to be human? This is the profound question because too often this is a question that never even enters the consciousness of the researcher, the teacher, or the student save for in a biology class. Wynter (2006, 2000, 1992, 1992[1990]) takes an ostensibly scientific question and applies it to the social studies because this question helps explain the centuries of dicey interactions between groups of humans and then, in

particular, the intentionally intensely brutal treatment both physically and psychologically of humans and peoples of African descent, Blacks.

For Wynter there is always an investigation to do, because she recognizes that people's actions are shaped and controlled by the societies that overlap which each person inhabits. Wynter recognizes that humans from the moment of birth are already equipped with but one biological imperative - an innate ability to grow toward adulthood and develop into adults. Everything else is a matter of decisions reached through human interactions. Wynter (2015, 2006, 2000, 1995, 1992[1990]) calls the interactions from which decisions emerge the sociogenic principle. From the sociogenic principle flows the ideas of native cultural model, which is the dominant cultural discourse that establishes the dominant hierarchy of how all social studies disciplines – anthropology (culture), economics (resource allocation), geography (locations/boundaries), history (analysis of human actions), political science (how power is used), psychology (what people think and why), sociology (what people do in groups) - will operate.

For Wynter there are the established rules and the rules yet to be established. Wynter (2015, 2006, 1970, 1969, 1968) recognizes that human actions operate and exist within given environments that fluctuate in power and utility over time. Given this she recognizes in her research that there are established ways to do correct social studies research and she honors that by never ever dismissing the established social studies canon that promotes written records and official documents with dates, recognized words, and

big ideas over spoken-word/griot texts and performance art that represents the acting out of what would otherwise have been written. For Wynter these other ways of expression – spoken-word/griot texts and performance art – are equally legitimate forms of research to be analyzed using the established ways of research. This means necessarily that the established research methods must shift and cannot be rigid as the risk of losing the voices of certain humans is unforgivable.

Wynter (2015, 2006, 2000, 1995) does not believe that any single culture has all of the answers. On this she shares agrees with Geertz – a local culture is the creation of a particular group of people in a particular place and time that fit their needs in that moment. It does not follow that a particular local culture is universally applicable just because a given group, the Spanish, conquer an already inhabited territory where the humans there, the Taino, already have a local culture and civilization that fits their needs. This is a key to understanding and using the Wynterian Approach in a useful manner. Wynter does not trust any essentialism because those are dead. Too much harm comes from blind acceptance of a single culture by too many people in an unquestioning manner. Here Wynter would include the trans-Saharan African slave trade, the trans-Atlantic African slave trade, the Eastern European Slavic slave trade to Asia, anti-women movements of any kind, anti-homosexual movements of any kind, the European colonization of Africa, the European colonization of Asia, the Holocaust of European Jews, the Holocaust of Armenians, the Holocaust of the Tutsi and Hutu, and capitalism

that prevents people from living at proper living standard that ensures enough food, healthcare, and security from exploitation. These are all human rights issues. Taken in total, Wynter offers a superb series of examples of how to tackle perplexing issues of human actions turned toward perpetrating harm and unraveling them to show that all of these harms are related and can be avoided, if only humans would choose “to sit down a talk about a little culture together” (Wynter, 1969, 1968).

References

- Alridge, D.P. (2006). The limits of the master narrative in history textbooks: An analysis of representations of Martin Luther King, Jr. *Teachers College Record*, 108(4), pp. 662-686.
- Anderson, A.N. et al. (2003). *Texas & Texans*. New York, NY: Glencoe McGraw-Hill
- Anyon, J. (2008). *Theory and educational research: Toward critical social explanation*. New York: Routledge.
- Anyon, J. (1982). Adequate social science, curriculum investigations, and theory. *Theory into Practice*, 21(1), *Curriculum Theory*, pp. 34-37.
- Anyon, J. (1981). Social class and school knowledge. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 11(1), pp. 3-42.
- Apple, M.W. (1983). Curriculum in the year 2000: Tensions and possibilities. *The Phi Delta Kappan*, 64(5), pp. 321-326.
- Apple, M.W. (1978). Ideology, reproduction, and educational reform. *Comparative Educational Review*, 22(3), pp. 367-387.

Apple, M.W. (1976). Curriculum as ideological selection.

Comparative Educational Review, 20(2), 209-215.

Banks, J.A. (2006). *Race, culture and education: The selected works of James A. Banks*.

New York, NY: Routledge Press.

Banks, J.A., Boehm, R.G. & Colleary, K.G. (2003). *Texas, our Texas*. New York, NY:

MacMillan/McGraw-Hill.

Barr, A. (1996/1973). *Black texans: A history of negroes in Texas, 1528-1836*,

2nd edition. Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press.

Barreto, J-M. (2013). Imperialism and decolonization scenarios in human rights history.

In J-M. Barreto. *Human rights from a third world perspective: Critique, history*

and international law, pp. 140-172. NY: Columbia Scholars Publishers.

Bogues, A. (2006). *Caribbean reasonings: After man towards the human*.

Kingston, Jamaica: Ian Randle Press.

Brazos county tourism brochure.pdf. (May 1, 2016). Retrieved from [http:](http://www.visitbrazosport.com/docs/Brazoria%20County%20Tourism%20Brochure.pdf)

[//www.visitbrazosport.com/docs/Brazoria%20County%20Tourism%20Brochure.pdf](http://www.visitbrazosport.com/docs/Brazoria%20County%20Tourism%20Brochure.pdf)

British Sociological Association (2005). Equality & diversity: Language and the BSA:

Ethnicity & Race (www.britisoc.co.uk).

Brown, A.L. (2010). Counter-memory and race: An examination of African American scholars' challenges to early twentieth century K-12 historical discourses.

The Journal of Negro Education, 79(1), pp.54-65.

Brown, A.L. & Brown, K.D. (2010a). Strange fruit indeed: Interrogating contemporary textbook representations of racial violence toward African-Americans.

Teachers College Record, 112(1), pp.31-67.

Brown, K.D. & Brown, A.L. (2010b). "Silenced memories: An examination of the sociocultural knowledge on race and racial violence in official school curriculum."

Equity & Excellence in Education, 43(2), pp.139-154.

Burkholder, M. (2012). *Spaniards in the colonial empire: Creoles and penninsulares*.

Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Burkholder, M. and Johnson, L.L. (2014). *Colonial latin america*, 9th ed. New York:

Oxford University Press.

Campbell, R.B. (1989). An empire for slavery: The peculiar institution in Texas:

1821-1865. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.

Campbell, R.B. (2003). *Gone to Texas: A history of the lone star state*. New York, NY:

Oxford University Press.

Campbell, R.B. (2010). *The laws of slavery in Texas: Historical documents and essays*.

Austin,Tx: University of Texas Press.

Cantrell, G. (1999). *Stephen F. Austin: Empresario of Texas*. New Haven, Conn.:

Yale University Press.

Capper, C. A. (1998, August). Critically oriented and postmodern perspectives:

Sorting out the differences and applications for practice. *Educational Administration*

Quarterly, 34, pp.354-379.

Carew, J. (1988). *Fulcrums of change*. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press.

Celebrating texas: Honoring the past, building the future. (2003). Evanston, Ill.:

McDougall Littell.

Chasteen. J.C. (2011). *Born in blood and fire: A concise history of latin america*.

New York: W.W. Norton.

Counts, G. (1932). "Dare the school build a new social order?" In D.J. Flinders,

S.J. Thornton Eds. *The curriculum studies reader*, 3rd Edition, pp. 45-51.

NY: Routledge Falmer.

Cox, O.C. (1948). *Caste, class, and race: A study in social dynamics*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Cremin, L. (1959). *The transformation of the school: Progressivism in american education, 1876-1957*. New York: Vintage Press.

Davis, J. (2000). *The white image in the black mind: A study of African American literature*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

De Las Casas, B. (1992/1552). *A short account of the destruction of the Indies*. New York: Penguin Books.

Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (2005/1987). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

De Lissovoy and Brown, A. (2013). "Antiracist Solidarity in Critical Education: Contemporary Problems and Possibilities." *The Urban Review*, 45(5), pp.539-560

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. NY: Macmillan.

Du Bois, W.E.B. (1994[1903]). *The souls of black folk*. Mineola, NY:

Dover Publications, Inc.

Dussel, E. (2013). "Las Casas, Vitoria and Suarez, 1514-1617." In Jose-Manuel Barreto,

Ed. *Human rights from a third world perspective: Critique, history, and*

international law, pp. 172 – 207. NY: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Dirck, B.R. (2012). *Abraham Lincoln and white america*. Lawrence, Kansas:

University of Kansas Press.

Du Bois, W.E.B. (1935). *Black reconstruction in america, 1860-1880*. New York:

Modern Library.

Eudell, D. (2006). *Caribbean reasonings: After man towards the human*. Kingston,

Jamaica: Ian Randle Press.

Eyerman, R. (2001). *Cultural trauma: Slavery and the formation of african american*

identity. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Fallace, T. (2009). "John Dewey's influence on the origins of the social studies:

An analysis of the historiography and new interpretation."

Review of Educational Research, 79(2), (June), pp.601-624.

Fehrenbach, T.R., Crowley, D., Siegel, S. (2003). *Lone star: The story of texas*.

Needham, Mass: Prentice Hall.

Finkelman, P. (2003). *Defending slavery: Proslavery thought in the old south:*

A brief history with documents. New York, NY: Bedford/St. Martin's Press.

Finkelman, P. (2001). *Slavery and the founders: Race and liberty in the age of jefferson.*

Armonk, NY: M.E.Sharpe.

Flores, R.R. (2002). *Remembering the alamo: Memory, modernity, and the master*

symbol. Austin,TX: University of Texas Press.

Flores, R.R. (1998). Memory-Place, meaning, and the Alamo.

American Literary History,10(3), 428-445.

Flores, R.R. (1995). Private visions, public culture: The making of the alamo.

Cultural Anthropology, Volume 10, No. 1 (February 1995), pp.99-115.

Furbee, L. (1996). The religion of politics in chiapas: Founding a cult of communicating

saints. *American Anthropological Association.*

Gaetano, E. (1997). *Open veins of latin america: Five centuries of the pillage of a*

continent. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures.* New York, NY: Basic Books.

- Githiora, C. (2008). *Afro-Mexicans: Discourse of race and identity in the african diaspora*. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press, Inc.
- Gordon, L. (1999). *Bad faith and antiblack racism*. New York: Humanity Books.
- Grossman, D. (2009). *On killing: The psychological cost of learning to kill in war and society*. New York, NY: Back Bay Books.
- Gutzman, K.R. (2012). *James Madison and the making of america*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.
- Hamilton, J. and Hunt, L. (1992/1940). *My master: The inside story of Sam Houston and his times: By his former slave Jeff Hamilton*. Abilene, TX: State House Press.
- Haynes, S.W. and Winz, C. (2001). *Problems in Texas history*. Boston, MA: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Hernandez Cuevas, M.P. (2004). *African mexicans and the discourse on modern nation*. Dallas, TX: University Press of America.
- Hess, D. (2008). "Controversial issues and democratic discourse." In L. S. Levstik, C. A. Tyson (Eds.) *Handbook in social studies education*, pp. 109-123. New York, NY: Routledge.

Higginbotham, A.L. (1996). *Shades of freedom: Racial politics and presumptions of the American legal system*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Hilliard III, A. (1998). *SBA: The reawakening of the African mind*. Gainesville, FL.: Makare Publishing.

Hodder, I. (1994). The interpretation of documents and material culture.

In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln(Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*
pp. 393-402. New York, NY: Sage.

Holy, L. (1984). Theory methodology and the research process. In R.F. Ellen (Ed.),

Ethnographic research: A guide to general conduct, pp. 13-34.

London: Academic Press.

Horne, G. (2005). *Black and brown: African americans and the Mexican revolution,*

1910-1920. New York, NY: NYU Press.

Hutchins, E. (1980). *Culture and inference*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Jehn, K. and Doucet, L. (1996). Developing categories from interview data:

Text analysis and multidimensional scaling. Part 1. *Cultural Anthropology*

Methods Journal 8(2), pp. 15-16.

- Joshi, S.T. and Bell, D. (1999). *Documents of American prejudice: An anthology of writings on race from Thomas Jefferson to David Duke*. New York: Basic Books
- King, J.E. (2008). "Appendix B-2: Race and our biocentric belief system: An interview with Sylvia Wynter.." In J.E. King (Ed). *Black education: A transformative research & action agenda for a new century*, pp. 361-366. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publisher.
- King, J.E. (1997). "Thank you for opening our minds": On praxis, transmutation, and black studies in teacher development." In J.E. King, E.R. Hollins, W.C. Hayman (Eds.). *Preparing teachers for cultural diversity*, pp. 156-174. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- King, J.E. (1991). Dysconscious racism: Ideology, identity, and the miseducation of teachers. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 60(1), pp. 133-146.
- Kottak, C (1998). Presenting anthropology to diverse audiences. In H. R. Bernard (Ed.) *Handbook of methods of cultural anthropology*, pp. 737-761. Lanham, MD: Altamira Press.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2001). "Crafting a culturally relevant social studies approach."

In E. Wayne Ross (Ed.) *The social studies curriculum: Purposes, problems and*

Possibilities, pp. 201-215. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Ladson-Billings, G., Brown, K. (2008) "Curriculum and cultural diversity."

In F. Michael Connelly, Ming Fang He, JoAnn Phillion (Eds.) *The Sage handbook*

of curriculum and instruction, pp. 153-175. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Publications.

Lather, P. (1991). *Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy with/in the*

postmodern. NY: Routledge.

Leary, J. D. (2005). *Post traumatic slave syndrome: America's legacy of enduring injury*

and healing. Milwaukie, Or: Uptone Press.

Leiker, J.N. (2007). "The difficulties of understanding Abe: Lincoln's reconciliation of

racial inequality and natural rights." In B.R. Dirck (Ed.) *Lincoln emancipated*

pp. 73-98. DeKalb, IL.: Northern Illinois University Press.

Letourneau, J, Moisan, S. (2004). "Young people's assimilation of a collective historical

memory: A case study of Quebeckers of French-Canadian heritage." In P. Seixas

(Ed.) *Theorizing historical consciousness*, pp. 109-128. Toronto: University of

Toronto Press.

Levesque, S. (2008). *Thinking historically: Educating students in the twenty-first century*.

Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Levesque, S. (2005). "Teaching second-order concepts in Canadian history:

The importance of "historical significance". *Canadian Social Studies* 39(2)

Winter, pp. 1-10.

Lipsitz, G. (1990). *Time passages: Collective memory and the American popular culture*.

, St.Paul, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Losurdo, D. (2011). *Liberalism: A counter-history*. New York, NY: Verso Books.

Lowenthal, D. (2000). "Dilemmas and delights of learning history." In P.N. Stearns,

P. Seixas, and P. Wineburg (Eds.) *Knowing, teaching & learning history: National and international perspectives*, pp. 63-82.

Matthews, H. (1992). The directive force of morality tales in a Mexican community.

In R. D'Andrade, C. Strauss (Eds). *Human motives and cultural models*,

pp.127 – 162. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

McKittrick, K. (2015). *Sylvia Wynter: On being human as praxis*. Durham, NC:

Duke University Press.

Miles, M. and Huberman, A.M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis*, 2nd ed.

Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Mignolo, W. (2006). *The idea of latin america*. Malden, MA.: Blackwell Publishing.

Mills, C. (1999) *The racial contract*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Nandy, A. (1993). *Barbaric others: A manifesto on western racism*. Boulder, Colorado:

Pluto Press.

Nelson, M.R. (1978). "Rugg on Rugg: His theories and his curriculum.

Curriculum Inquiry, 8(2),(Summer), pp. 119-132.

Newcomb, S.T. (2008). *Pagans in the promised land: Decoding the doctrine of christian*

discovery. Golden, CO: Fulcrum Press.

Nora, P. (1989). Between memory and history: Les lieux de memoire.

Representations, No. 26, Special Issue: Memory and Counter-Memory, pp.7-24.

Pagden, A. (1982). *The fall of natural man: The american indian and the origins of*

comparative ethnology. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Parker, W.C. (2008). "Knowing and doing in democratic citizenship education." In L. S.

Levstik, C. A Tyson (Eds.) *Handbook in social studies education* (pp. 65-80).

New York, NY: Routledge.

Parker, W.C. (2006). "Public discourses in schools: Purposes, problems, possibilities."

Educational Researcher, 35(8), pp. 19-29.

Parker, W.C. (2005). "Teaching against idiocy." *Phi Delta Kappan*, 86(5), pp. 344-351.

Pinar, W.F. (1977). "The reconceptualization of curriculum studies." In D.J. Flinders,

S.J. Thornton (Eds.) *The curriculum studies reader*, 3rd Edition, pp. pp. 168-175.

New York, NY: RoutledgeFalmer.,

Pugsley, Wm. And Duncan, M. (2010). *The laws of slavery in Texas:*

Historical documents and essays. Austin, Tx: University of Texas Press.

Reddick, L. (1934). Racial attitudes in american history textbooks of the south.

The Journal of Negro History, 19, pp.225-265.

Ruesen, J. (2005). *Western historical thinking: An intercultural debate*. New York, NY:

Berghahn Books.

Rugg, H.O. et al (1926/1969). *The foundations of curriculum-making*. New York, NY:

Arno Press & The New York Times.

Rugg, H.O. (1922). "America's march toward democracy."

The social science pamphlets. New York, NY: The Lincoln School.

----- (1922). "How nations live together." *The social science pamphlets.*

New York, NY: The Lincoln School.

----- (1922). "Town and city life in america." *The social science pamphlets.*

New York, NY: The Lincoln School.

----- (1922). "Waste and conservation of america's resources." *The social science pamphlets.* New York, NY: The Lincoln School.

Rugg, H.O. and Shumaker, A. (1928). *The child-centered school:*

An appraisal of the new education. New York, NY: World Book Company.

Rugg, H.O. (1941). *That men may understand: An american in the long armistice.*

New York, NY: Doubleday.

-----Rugg, H.O. (1952). *The teacher of teachers: Frontiers of theory and practice in teacher education.* New York, NY: Harper & Brothers.

Rugg, H.O. and Withers, Wm. (1955). *Social foundations of education.*

New York, NY: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Rugg, H. O. (1963). *Imagination.* New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Rugg, H. O. (1969/[1927]) *The foundations of curriculum-making*. New York, NY:

Arno Press & The New York Times.

Rugg, H.O. (1952). *The teacher of teachers: Frontiers of theory and practice in teacher education*. New York, NY: Harper & Brothers, Publishers.

Saxe, D.W. (1991). *Social studies in the schools: A history in the schools*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Seixas, P. (2006). "What is historical consciousness?" In R. Sandwell, (ed.).

To the past: History education, public memory & citizenship in Canada.

pp. 11-12. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Seixas, P. (2004). Introduction. In P. Seixas (Ed.) *Theorizing historical consciousness*.

pp. 3-24. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Seixas, P. (2002). The purposes of teaching Canadian history. *Canadian Social Studies*, 36(2), 1-7.

Seixas, P. (2000). "Schweigen! Die Kinder or Does postmodern history have its place in schools. In P.N. Stearns, P. Seixas, and P. Wineburg (Eds.) *Knowing, teaching & learning history: National and international perspectives*. pp. 1-14.

Seixas, P. (1999). Beyond content and pedagogy: In search of a way to talk about history education. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 31 (May-June), pp. 317-337.

Seixas, P. (1998). Student teachers thinking historically. *Theory and Research in Social Education* 26 (Summer), 310-341.

Seixas, P. (1997). Mapping the terrain of historical significance. *Social Education* 61 (Winter), pp. 22-27.

Seixas, P. (1993a). Historical understanding among adolescents in a multicultural setting. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 23(1), pp. 301-327.

Seixas, P. (1993b). Parallel crises: History and the social studies curriculum in the USA. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 23(3), pp. 235-250.

Shulman, L. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57, pp. 1-22.

Social Studies, Texas. (2003). New York, NY: Scott Foresman & Co.-
Pearson Education, Inc.

Smallwood, A. and Elliot, J. (1997). *The atlas of African-American history and politics: From slave trade to modern times*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill Education.

- Spradley, J.P. (1980). *Participant observation*. New York, NY: Holt, Reinhart and Winston.
- Strauss, A. and Corbin J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Swartz, E. (2007). Stepping outside the master script: Re-connecting the history of American education. *The Journal of Negro Education*, Volume 76, No. 2 (Spring, 2007), pp. 173-186.
- Swartz, E. (1993). Multicultural education: Disrupting patterns of white supremacy in school curricula, practices and pedagogy. *The Journal of Negro Education*, Volume 62, No. 4 (Autumn, 1993), pp.493-506.
- Swartz, E. (1992). Emancipatory narratives: Rewriting the master script in the school curriculum. *The Journal of Negro Education*, Volume 61, No. 3, *Africentrism and Multiculturalism: Conflict or Consonance*, (Summer, 1992), pp. 341-355.
- Tedlock, B. (1991). From participant observation to the observation of participation: The emergence of narrative ethnography. *Journal of Anthropological Research* 47(1), pp. 69-94.

Texas Education Agency/TEA (2011). *Social Studies TEKS*. Retrieved from:

<http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index2.aspx?id=3643>.

Texas History. (2015). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Texas History. (2015). New York, NY: McGraw Hill Education.

Texas History. (2015). Upper Saddle, NJ: Pearson Education.

Texas Studies Weekly. (2015). Oren, UT: American Legacy Publishing.

Thelen, D. (1989). Memory and American history. *The Journal of American History*,
Volume 75, No.4 (March, 1989), pp. 1117-1129.

Trilling, B. and Fadel, C. (2012). *21st century skills: Learning for life in our times*.
San Francisco, CA.; Jossey-Bass Publishing.

Trouillot, M-R. (1995). *Silencing the past: Power and the production of history*.
Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Trouillot, M-R. (1990). Good day Columbus: Silences, power, and public history
(1492-1892). *Public Culture*, *Volume 3*, No. 1 (Fall 1990), pp. 1-22.

Tuan, Y. F. (2013 [1980]). *Landscapes of fear*. Minneapolis, MN.:
University of Minnesota Press.

Turner, V. (1969). *The ritual process: Structure and anti-structure*. Chicago, IL:

Aldine Publishing.

Tyler, R.W. (1949). Basic principles of curriculum and instruction. In D.J. Flinders,

S.J.Thornton (Eds.) *The curriculum studies reader*, 3rd Edition, pp. 69-77.

New York, NY: RoutledgeFalmer.

VanSledright, B. (2011). *The challenge of rethinking history education*.

New York, NY: Routledge.

VanSledright, B. (2008). Narratives of nation-state, historical knowledge, and

school history education. *Review of Research in Education*, 32, (February),

pp. 109-146.

VanSledright, B. (2004). What does it mean to read history? Fertile ground for cross-

disciplinary collaborations? *Reading Research Quarterly*, 39(3), (July-September),

pp. 342-346.

VanSledright, B. (2002a). Confronting history's interpretive paradox while teaching

fifth graders to investigate the past. *American Educational Research Journal*, 39(4),

(Winter), pp.1089-1115.

- Van Sledright, B. (2002b). *In search of America's past: Learning to read history in elementary school*. New York, NY: Teachers College.
- VanSledright, B. (1997) Can more be less? Depth-over breadth reforms, teaching, and representing history. *Social Education*, 61, pp. 38-42
- VanSledright, B., Afflenbach, P. (2001). Hath! Doth! What!: Middle graders reading innovative history texts. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy* 44, pp. 696-707.
- VanSledright, B. , Brophy, J. (1992). Storytelling, imagination and fanciful elaboration in children's historical reconstructions. *American Educational Research Journal*, 29(4), (Winter), pp. 837-859.
- VanSledright, B., Kelly, R. (1998). Reading American history: The influence of multiple sources on six fifth graders. *The Elementary School Journal* 98 (January), pp. 239-265.
- Vasquez Heilig, J., Brown, K.D., & Brown, A.L. (2012). The illusion of inclusion: A critical race theory textual analysis of race and standards. *Harvard Educational Review*, 82(3), pp. 403-424.
- Veracini, L. (2010). *Settler colonialism: A theoretical overview*. New York, NY:

Palgrave Macmillan.

Wade, P. (1997). *Race and ethnicity in latin america*. Sterling, VA.: Pluto Press.

Walker, J. & Erwin, W. (2011). *Texas state cemetery*. Austin, TX:

University of Texas Press.

Wallerstein, I. (1996). *Open the social sciences: Report of the Gulbekian commission on restructuring of the social sciences*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Walvin, J. (2006). *Atlas of slavery*. Harlow, England: Pearson Longman.

Wineburg, S. (2004). Crazy for history. *Journal of American History* 90 (March).

Wineburg, S. (2001a). *Historical thinking and other unnatural acts: Charting the future of teaching the past*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Wineburg, S. (2000). Making historical sense. In P.N. Stearns, P. Seixas, and P. Wineburg (Eds.). *Knowing, teaching & learning history: National and international perspectives*, pp. 306-326. New York, NY: NYU Press.

Wineburg, S. (1991). On the reading of historical texts: Notes on the breach between school and academy. *American Educational Research Journal* 28(3), (Autumn), pp.495-519.

Wineburg, S., Fournier, J. (1994). Contextualized thinking in history. In J.F. Voss and M. Carretero Eds.). *Cognitive and instructional processes in history and the social sciences*, pp. 285-308. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Press.

Wineburg, S., Mosburg, S., Porat, D. (2001). What can forrest gump tell us about student's historical understanding? *Social Education* (January), pp.1-6.

Wineburg, S., Mosburg, S., Porat, D., Duncan, A. (2007). Common belief and the cultural curriculum: An intergenerational study of historical consciousness. *American Educational Research Journal*, 44(1), pp.40-76.

Winkle, K.J. (2007). Paradox though it may seem: Lincoln on antislavery, race, and union. In B.R. Dirck (Ed.) *Lincoln emancipated*, pp. 8-28. DeKalb, IL.: Northern Illinois University Press.

Woyshner, C. (2009). Introduction: Histories of social studies thought and practice in schools and communities. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 37(4), pp. 426-431.

Wynter, S. (2003). Unsettling the coloniality of being/power/truth/freedom: Towards the human, after man, its overrepresentation—An argument. CR: *The New Centennial*

Review, 3:3, (Fall 2003): pp. 257-337.

Wynter, S. (2001). Towards the sociogenic principle: Fanon, identity, the puzzle of conscious experience. Mercedes F. Durán-Cogan and Antonio Gómez-Moriana, eds.

National identities and socio-political changes in Latin America, pp. 30-66.

New York: Routledge.

Wynter, S. (1995) 1492: A new world view. In Vera Lawrence and Rex Nettleford, eds.

Race, discourse, and the origin of the Americas: A new world view. Washington and

London: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1995: 5-57.

Wynter, S. (1992). Colombus, the ocean blue and ‘fables that stir the mind’: To reinvent the study of letters. In Bainard Cohen and Jefferson Humphries, eds. *Poetics of the*

americas: Race, founding and textuality, pp. 141-164. Baton Rouge, LA:

Louisiana State University Press.

Wynter, S. (1992[1990]). *Do not call us negroes: How multicultural textbooks perpetuate racism*. San Francisco, CA: Aspire.

Wynter, S. (1971). “Novel and history, plot and plantation.” *Savacou* 5: pp. 95-102

Wynter, S. (1970). Jonkonnu in Jamaica: Towards the interpretation of folk dance as

cultural process. *Jamaica Journal* 4.2: pp. 34-48.

Wynter, S. (1969). We must learn to sit down together and talk about a little culture:

Reflections of west indian writing and criticism. *Jamaica Journal* 2.4 (1968):

pp. 23-32; *Jamaica Journal* 3.1 (1969): pp. 27-42.

Wynter, S. (2010 [1962]). *The hills of hebron*. Kingston, Jamaica: Ian Randle Publishers.

Wynter, S. and Scott, D. (2000). The re-enchantment of humanism: An interview with

Sylvia Wynter. *Small Axe*, 8, (September 2000): pp. 119-207.

(Wynter, S., personal communication in a card, June 3, 2009).